

A Study Of The Master Of Education In Educational Leadership Program At The University Of Central Florida: Standards Alignment And Student Perceptions

2013

Vickie Santostefano
University of Central Florida

Find similar works at: <https://stars.library.ucf.edu/etd>

University of Central Florida Libraries <http://library.ucf.edu>

 Part of the [Educational Leadership Commons](#)

STARS Citation

Santostefano, Vickie, "A Study Of The Master Of Education In Educational Leadership Program At The University Of Central Florida: Standards Alignment And Student Perceptions" (2013). *Electronic Theses and Dissertations*. 2687.
<https://stars.library.ucf.edu/etd/2687>

This Doctoral Dissertation (Open Access) is brought to you for free and open access by STARS. It has been accepted for inclusion in Electronic Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of STARS. For more information, please contact lee.dotson@ucf.edu.

A STUDY OF THE MASTER OF EDUCATION IN EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP
PROGRAM AT THE UNIVERSITY OF CENTRAL FLORIDA:
STANDARDS ALIGNMENT AND STUDENT PERCEPTIONS

by

VICKIE MICHELLE SANTOSTEFANO
B.A. University of Louisiana at Monroe, 1995
M.Ed. Southern Arkansas University, 2008

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Doctor of Education
in the School of Teaching, Learning, and Leadership
in the College of Education
at the University of Central Florida
Orlando, Florida

Summer Term
2013

Major Professor: Barbara Murray

© 2013 Vickie Michelle Santostefano

ABSTRACT

This study was conducted to determine the effectiveness of the University of Central Florida's Master's Program in Educational Leadership. This study was a mixed mode study which used archival data, survey data, interviews, and Florida Educational Leadership Examination results. Research questions were developed to address how course content in the University of Central Florida's Master of Education in Educational Leadership Program aligned with the following standards and competencies: (a) the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE/Educational Leadership Constituent Council (ELCC), (b) the Interstate School Leader Licensure Consortium (ISLLC), (c) the Florida Educator Accomplished Practices (FEAPS), (d) the Florida Principal Leadership Standards (FPLS), and (e) the Florida Educational Leadership Examination (FELE). Graduates' perceptions of the University of Central Florida's Master of Education in Educational Leadership Program and results of Florida Educational Leadership examination results for 2009-2012 were analyzed.

Courses were found to meet all standards very well. There were a few standards that were not addressed directly in syllabi. Faculty interviews, however, revealed content was addressed in the actual coursework. Students, overall, were positive in their survey responses as to their satisfaction with the program. Finally, UCF students' FELE scores greatly exceeded the state average for all students, indicating that the UCF Educational Leadership courses and experiences were effective in preparing students for this examination.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to take this opportunity to acknowledge those whose contributions led to my ability to successfully accomplish this goal. First, Dr. Barbara Murray, thank you so much for chairing my committee and directing me down the path to this research. To Dr. Walter Doherty, Dr. Cynthia Hutchinson, and Dr. Kenneth Murray, I sincerely appreciate you for taking your time to serve on my committee.

Dr. Mary Ann Lynn, my wonderful editor, your assistance was the only way I made it through the writing process. To my children, Brian and Brandie, thank you for inspiring me to start this trip. My desire to set an example for you led me to seek higher education in the first place. To my stepson, Andrew, thank you for putting up with me sitting on the computer every weekend, it was totally worth it.

Finally to my husband, Peter, without whom I would still be watching television, rather than finishing this dissertation. You understood that I was procrastinating and pushed me toward the finish line. I love you so much for your continued belief that I could do this.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES	viii
LIST OF ACRONYMS	x
CHAPTER 1 THE PROBLEM AND ITS CLARIFYING COMPONENTS.....	1
Introduction.....	1
Statement of the Problem.....	2
Purpose of the Study	3
Background of the Study	3
Conceptual Framework.....	5
Definition of Terms.....	6
Assumptions.....	8
Delimitations of the Study	8
Research Questions.....	10
Methodology.....	10
Population and Sample	10
Research Design.....	11
Data Collection and Analysis.....	11
Significance of the Study	12
Organization of the Study	13
CHAPTER 2 REVIEW OF LITERATURE	14
Introduction.....	14
The Evolution of the Principalship	15
The Evolution of Principal Preparation Programs	20
Contemporary Initiatives in Principal Preparation	26
Regional and National Influences on Principal Preparation Programs.....	39
Southern Regional Education Board (SREB).....	39
Education Commission of the States (ECS)	40
U. S. Department of Education	41
The Education Schools Project	42
National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE)	44
Conceptual Framework.....	44
Educational Leadership Constituent Council (ELCC).....	45
Educational Leadership Constituent Council (ELCC) Building Level Standards–2011	46
Interstate School Leader Licensure Consortium (ISLLC).....	47
Florida Educator Accomplished Practices (FEAPs).....	51
Florida Principal Leadership Standards (FPLS)	52
Florida Educational Leadership Examination (FELE)	55
The University of Central Florida’s Principal Preparation Program	57

Summary	60
CHAPTER 3 METHODOLOGY	61
Introduction.....	61
Purpose of the Study	61
Research Setting.....	61
Research Design.....	62
Sources of Data	63
Alignment of Course Objectives with Standards	63
Master of Education in Educational Leadership Exit Survey	64
Florida Educational Leadership Examination (FELE) Results.....	65
Archival Documentation	66
Analysis of Data.....	66
Research Question 1	68
Research Question 2	68
Research Question 3	69
Summary	70
CHAPTER 4 ANALYSIS OF THE DATA	71
Introduction.....	71
Data Analysis for Research Question 1	72
Florida Educator Accomplished Practices (FEAPs).....	72
Florida Educational Leadership Examination (FELE) Competencies	74
Florida Principal Leadership Standards (FPLS)	77
Interstate School Leader Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) Standards	78
National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education	78
Research Question 2	78
Research Question 3	82
Summary	96
CHAPTER 5 SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	97
Introduction.....	97
Statement of the Problem.....	97
Methodology	98
Population and Sample	98
Research Design.....	98
Summary and Discussion of Findings	99
Research Question 1	100
Research Question 2	102
Research Question 3	102
Implications and Recommendations for Practice	104
Recommendations for Further Research.....	107

APPENDIX A	COMPETENCIES AND SKILLS: CERTIFICATION IN EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP IN FLORIDA, FOURTH EDITION, 2012.....	108
APPENDIX B	EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP CONSTITUENT COUNCIL (ELCC/NCATE) STANDARDS	117
APPENDIX C	INTERSTATE SCHOOL LEADER LICENSURE CONSORTIUM (ISLLC).....	122
APPENDIX D	THE FLORIDA EDUCATOR ACCOMPLISHED PRACTICES (FEAPs).....	126
APPENDIX E	FLORIDA PRINCIPAL LEADERSHIP STANDARDS (FPLS).....	129
APPENDIX F	FLORIDA EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP EXAMINATION (FELE)	133
APPENDIX G	MATRICES ALIGNING EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP COURSES WITH STANDARDS	141
APPENDIX H	MASTER OF EDUCATION IN EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP EXIT SURVEY	179
APPENDIX I	INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD APPROVAL	182
	LIST OF REFERENCES	184

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1	Highest Degree Earned by Supervising Principals 1928-1958.....	19
Table 2	Six Stages of School Administration: 1865-1985.....	22
Table 3	Four Eras of Administrator Preparation Program Development (1800-Present)	23
Table 4	Florida Principal Leadership Standards (2011)	55
Table 5	Florida Educational Leadership Examination 2009: Subtests and Components	56
Table 6	UCF Educational Leadership Program of Study: M. Ed. in Educational Leadership.....	59
Table 7	Research Questions, Sources of Data, and Data Analysis	70
Table 8	Florida Educator Accomplished Practices (FEAPs) Not Aligned With Course Content.....	74
Table 9	Florida Educational Leadership Examination Competencies and Skills Not Aligned With Course Content.....	76
Table 10	Florida Principal Leadership Standards (FPLS) Not Aligned with Course Content.....	77
Table 11	EDA 6946 Internship Total Enrollments and Surveys Returned.....	80
Table 12	Perceptions of Program Graduates: Analysis of Survey Data	81
Table 13	UCF Pass Rates for Florida Educational Leadership Examination Administrations: April 2009-October 2012	83
Table 14	Florida Educational Leadership Examination Subtest 1: Instructional Leadership (Instructional Leadership)	85
Table 15	Florida Educational Leadership Examination Subtest 1: Instructional Leadership (Managing the Learning Environment).....	87
Table 16	Florida Educational Leadership Examination Subtest 1: Instructional Leadership (Learning, Accountability, and Assessment)	88

Table 17 Florida Educational Leadership Examination Subtest 2: Operational Leadership (Technology)	89
Table 18 Florida Educational Leadership Examination Subtest 2: Operational Leadership (Human Resource Development)	91
Table 19 Florida Educational Leadership Examination Subtest 2: Operational Leadership (Ethical Leadership)	92
Table 20 Florida Educational Leadership Examination Subtest 2: Operational Leadership (Decision-Making Strategies)	93
Table 21 Florida Educational Leadership Examination Subtest 3: School Leadership.	95

LIST OF ACRONYMS

ELCC	Educational Leadership Constituents Council
FEAPs	Florida Educator Accomplished Practices
FELE	Florida Educational Leadership Exam
FLPS	Florida Principal Leadership Standards
ISLLC	Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium
NCATE	National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education
NCLB	No Child Left Behind
SLPPS	School Leadership Preparation and Practice Survey
SREB	Southern Regional Education Board
UCF	University of Central Florida

CHAPTER 1 THE PROBLEM AND ITS CLARIFYING COMPONENTS

Introduction

Educating the nation's children has been at the forefront of the public's mind since the publication of "A Nation at Risk" in 1983. Although the focus has generally been on teachers and students, principals and other building level administrators have come to be regarded as central to the task of building schools that promote powerful teaching and learning for all students (National Commission on Excellence in Educational Administration, 1988). Research completed by Leithwood, Seashore- Louis, Anderson, and Wahlstrom (2004), indicated that leadership is second only to classroom instruction among school-related factors that influence student outcomes. According to Peterson (1985) this recognition along with a growing shortage of high-quality leaders in American schools has heightened interest in leadership development as a major reform strategy.

As early as 1980, "effective schools" research identified the importance of principals who function as instructional leaders (Levine, 1990). It became increasingly apparent that having strong instructional leaders was a key factor in schools that performed better than others with a similar population. Over the years, the pressure increased for principals to be increasingly accountable and to serve as instructional leaders. Principals in the 21st century have found they can no longer rely on management strategies of the 20th century but must have new knowledge and skills.

It follows that as the demands for a more sophisticated type of leadership grew, the preparation of these leaders would also be impacted. Thus, principal preparation programs have experienced some of the same challenges. They have been called upon to meet multiple standards by state and national agencies. Most of these standards have been revised with 21st century knowledge and skills in mind. The standards call for increased scrutiny and attention to the skills and knowledge that entry-level principals should possess and increased accountability on the parts of higher education institutions as to their role in ensuring that program graduates possess the requisite skills and knowledge.

This research was designed to determine the extent to which one university-based principal preparation program was aligned with selected state and national standards and the extent to which graduates perceived the program as meeting their needs.

Statement of the Problem

Since the adoption of revised standards and competencies between 2002 and 2005, the Master of Education in Educational Leadership Program at the University of Central Florida has not been formally reviewed to determine the alignment of courses in the program with the standards and competencies put forth by various state agencies and national professional entities concerned with program quality. There are five sets of standards and competencies that guide the program, i.e., Florida Educator Accomplished Practices (FEAPs), Florida Educational Leadership Examination Competencies (FELE), Florida Principal Leadership Standards (FPLS), Educational Leadership Constituents

Council (ELCC), and the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC). It was important that this review be completed in order to identify any voids in the program and to ensure that students were well-prepared for their positions as school leaders.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to determine the efficacy of the Master of Education in Educational Leadership Program at the University of Central Florida. The study was conducted to ensure that course content in the program is aligned with respected standards in the field and to identify any areas of weakness of students in completing the Florida Educational Leadership examination. Additionally, perceptions of students enrolled in the program were reviewed to determine the extent to which they believed the program had been effective in meeting their needs.

Background of the Study

Since the early 1900s, administrators' roles in education have lacked clear definition (McClure, 1921). This lack of clarity has led to a tremendous amount of variability in background and training. In 1918, Judd posited, in his seminal education text that education should be looked at scientifically and educators should receive training. Since that time, there have been many stages of development in educational administration and several important changes in administrator preparation programs.

In the 1960s, there was a major push for more theory to be included in university-based educational administration preparation programs (UCEA, 1963). Up to that point,

most of the training had been business- or procedure-focused. The belief was that in order to make more progress, specific research-based theories that were based on the administration of educational agencies were necessary.

In 1983, with the publication of *A Nation at Risk* and 1988 with the publication of *Leaders for America's Schools*, it became apparent that the current strategy for preparing leaders was not working. Achilles (1994) stated that the complete administrator knows what to do, how to do it, and most important of all why an action is appropriate.

Hallinger and Murphy (1987) agreed that the “one best model” was not working. At that time, critics attacked the quality of candidates, low admission standards, and incoherent programs. It was during this time period that the importance of practice in the form of internships came to the forefront.

By the year 2000, increased emphasis on accountability had impacted all aspects of American schools and resulted in an increased focus on the effectiveness of leadership preparation. The problems that were found in 1963 and 1985, however, continued to be revisited. The low quality of candidates with many people “certified” to be administrators, but few who were actually “qualified.” According to the Southern Regional Education Board, the difference between a certified principal and a qualified principal was an important one that resulted in the creation of 13 critical factors (Bottoms & O’Neil, 2001). Other state, regional and national groups have developed their own guidelines and standards which have influenced programmatic directions taken by university-based administrator preparation programs. Still, university-based programs are often vilified for being too focused on theory with insufficient attention to practice.

The critics believe that this emphasis results in well educated people who are not necessarily prepared to handle the everyday stressors of administration.

Conceptual Framework

Principal preparation programs have undergone changes based on the evolution of education for approximately 100 years. As the education system in the United States has changed over the years, so has the role of the principal. With these changes has come the need to re-examine administrator preparation.

The Master of Education in Educational Leadership Program at the University of Central Florida, has been influenced by the guidelines, standards, competencies, and certification requirements of various states, regional and national agencies. It was these varied criteria that comprised the conceptual framework for this study. This study was conducted primarily to examine the extent to which the program was aligned with five sets of standards so as to determine any gaps that may exist. Included were standards of (a) the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE/Educational Leadership Constituent Council (ELCC), (b) the Interstate School Leader Licensure Consortium (ISLLC), (c) the Florida Educator Accomplished Practices (FEAPs), (d) the Florida Principal Leadership Standards (FPLS), and (e) the Florida Educational Leadership Examination (FELE).

The success of any program can be influenced by the perception of its' graduates. Thus, the perceptions of students about the program, as revealed by survey data, were also considered in the research. It was anticipated that through this study the researcher

would be able to identify gaps, if any, that may have existed in the program and areas where program modifications may be warranted to meet the needs of students preparing for leadership roles in education. Understanding the ways in which the program addresses those needs and finding areas of weakness was the purpose of this study.

Definition of Terms

The following terms are defined for this study:

Educational administration: the operation and management of learning institutions, such as public schools, colleges, and universities

Educational administrators: individuals who occupy leadership roles in educational institutions, i.e., people who work in positions such as principal, vice (assistant) principals, dean, academic dean, and college or university professor.

Master of Education in Educational Leadership Program: the university- based program that provides a “theoretical and conceptual knowledge base required for principalship and for Florida Level I Educational Leadership certification.” (UCF Graduate Catalog, 2012)

Programmatic Competencies and Standards for Educational Leadership: the five sets of standards and competencies to which the Master of Education in Educational Leadership is aligned in this research:

1. Educational Leadership Constituent Council (ELCC) Building Level

Standards: National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) based standards for advanced programs in educational leadership

for principals, superintendents, curriculum directors, and supervisors.

(National Policy Board for Educational Administration, 2011)

2. Florida Educator Accomplished Practices (FEAPs): Florida's core standards for effective educators that provide valuable guidance to Florida's public school educators and educator preparation programs throughout the state on what educators are expected know and be able to do. (Florida Educator Accomplished Practices, 2010)
3. Florida Educational Leadership Examination (FELE) Competencies and Skills: a comprehensive listing of the requirements for demonstrating competency and knowledge in the areas of Instructional Leadership, Operational Leadership, and School Leadership (FDOE, 2009).
4. Florida Principal Leadership Standards (FPLS): the Standards set forth in rule as Florida's core expectations for effective school administrators. The Standards are based on contemporary research on multi-dimensional school leadership, and represent skill sets and knowledge bases needed in effective schools. The Standards form the foundation for school leader personnel evaluations and professional development systems, school leadership preparation programs, and educator certification requirements (Florida Principal Leadership Standards, 2006)
5. Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) Standards: standards that provide high-level guidance and insight about the traits,

functions of work, and responsibilities that will be asked of school and district leaders. (Melmer, Burmaster, James, & Wilhoit, 2008)

Assumptions

1. It was assumed that the standards and course objectives used in the alignment process would be appropriate measures to use in the review of course syllabi.
2. It was assumed that an objective/standard was covered if it was mentioned in the course syllabus.
3. It was assumed that the Exit Survey was an appropriate source of perceptions of program completers as to the effectiveness of the Master of Education in Educational Leadership Program.
4. It was assumed that voids in the program were able to be identified after completing alignment of standards with program courses, review of Florida Educational Leadership Examination results, and results of the Exit Survey.

Delimitations of the Study

1. The research was delimited to the Master of Education in Educational Leadership Program. Modified Core, Education Specialist, and Doctoral Programs were excluded from the study.
2. The student perceptions of the Master of Education in Educational Leadership Program were delimited to that information that could be obtained from the

responses of students who completed the University of Central Florida's Educational Leadership Exit Survey between August, 2007 and May, 2012.

3. The alignment of courses was delimited to an examination of course descriptions obtained from the University of Central Florida 2012-2013 Graduate Catalog and official course syllabi. Identified courses were matched against the following standards and competencies: (a) the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE/Educational Leadership Constituent Council (ELCC), (b) the Interstate School Leader Licensure Consortium (ISLLC), (c) the Florida Educator Accomplished Practices (FEAPs), (d) the Florida Principal Leadership Standards (FPLS), and (e) the Florida Educational Leadership Examination (FELE).
4. The manner in which the Florida Department of Education has reported the results of the Florida Educational Leadership Examination (FELE) has changed over the years.
5. Areas of weakness identified for program graduates were delimited to those areas which were identified in a review of the results of the Florida Educational Leadership Examination for the years 2009-2011.
6. During the writing of this dissertation the Florida Department of Education revised the FELE Competencies (December, 2012). Those competencies are listed in Appendix A, but were not used in this research.

Research Questions

The following questions guided this research:

1. How does course content in the University of Central Florida's Master of Education in Educational Leadership Program align with the following standards and competencies: (a) the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE/Educational Leadership Constituent Council (ELCC), (b) the Interstate School Leader Licensure Consortium (ISLLC), (c) the Florida Educator Accomplished Practices (FEAP), (d) the Florida Principal Leadership Standards (FPLS), and (e) the Florida Educational Leadership Examination (FELE).
2. What are graduates' perceptions of the University of Central Florida's Master of Education in Educational Leadership Program?
3. What, if any, content and knowledge voids exists, based on the analysis of Florida Educational Leadership examination results for 2008-2011?

Methodology

Population and Sample

This study was focused on graduates of the Master of Education in Educational Leadership Program. To obtain the perceptions of program graduates, the population for this study consisted of graduates of the Master of Education in Educational Leadership Program at the University of Central Florida between summer 2007 and fall 2011. The

sample was a convenience sample of those program graduates who voluntarily completed surveys at the conclusion of their administrative internships, immediately prior to completing their master's degrees for the terms beginning in spring of 2008 and ending in fall of 2011.

Research Design

This study employed a mixed-method design consisting of qualitative and quantitative methods. In order to determine the alignment of program courses with standards and competencies, a content analysis was performed matching the five sets of standards and competencies to all courses and field experiences in the program. To determine the perceptions of program graduates, results of exit survey: UCF Master's in Educational Leadership Exit Survey were analyzed. The FELE data were collected from the data released from the Florida Department of Education to the University of Central Florida.

Data Collection and Analysis

Data used in this study was archival. To perform the content analysis, course descriptions and course syllabi were matched with standards and competencies to assess the extent to which they are aligned and if there were any gaps or weaknesses.

To determine the perceptions regarding program effectiveness of graduates of the Master of Education in Educational Leadership Program, data from 107 surveys administered between spring 2008 and fall 2011 were analyzed. Program perceptions

were collected from administrative internship completers enrolled in the Master of Education in Educational Leadership Program at the University of Central Florida.

The FELE data were analyzed to determine strengths and weaknesses in each of the three main sections of the test. These results were also compared to state averages, where appropriate.

Significance of the Study

This study was important to make certain that the content of the University of Central Florida's Master of Education in Educational Leadership Program was aligned with recognized professional standards and competencies and ensure relevance between the formal structure of the program and the standards, guidelines, and competencies established by state, regional, and national entities. Curriculum alignment with standards and student responses was helpful in identifying content and knowledge voids in addition to any that were apparent in a review of Florida Educational Leadership Examination reports. This review was intended to lead to appropriate modifications, if needed, in the program. In addition, survey data added an important dimension to the study by reviewing the insights of students who had completed the program as to the usefulness of courses and experiences in the program designed to provide them with essential theoretical and practical preparation needed by administrators.

Organization of the Study

Chapter 1 has provided an overview of the study. Described were the purpose and the background of the study along with the conceptual framework. Also included was a brief discussion of the research design, population, data collection and analysis procedures and significance of the study. Chapter 2 includes a review of related literature related to the evolution of the principalship and preparation programs for principals and the five sets of standards and competencies which are at the heart of this research. Chapter 3 describes the methods and procedures used in the collection and analysis of data for the current study. Chapter 4 includes an analysis of the data and the presentation of results. Chapter 5 presents a summary of the study, implications for practice and recommendations for future research.

CHAPTER 2 REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Introduction

An overview of the proposed research was presented in Chapter 1 to clarify the purpose of the study and the manner in which it was conducted. This chapter contains a review of the literature and related research relevant to key aspects of the study.

This chapter is organized to present historical data documenting (a) the evolution of the principalship in the United States, the postsecondary programs preparing principals for the nation's schools, and the issues that have emerged regarding principal preparation programs; (b) regional and national influences on administrator preparation programs; (c) the development of Educational Leadership Programs in Florida, with special emphasis on the University of Central Florida's Educational Leadership M.Ed. program; and (d) the conceptual framework for the study.

The conceptual framework for the study consisted of the various sets of standards to which the program must adhere. Thus, literature and research related to five sets of standards was reviewed to provide the conceptual framework and a context for the study. These include standards of (a) the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE/Educational Leadership Constituent Council (ELCC)), (b) the Interstate School Leader Licensure Consortium (ISLLC), (c) the Florida Educator Accomplished Practices (FEAPs), (d) the Florida Principal Leadership Standards (FPLS), and (e) the Florida Educational Leadership Examination (FELE). Literature related to

each of these sets of standards was reviewed, as it is these standards with which the courses and field experiences associated with the M.Ed. program must be aligned.

The Evolution of the Principalship

What is the job of a principal and where did this position originate? According to Malone and Caddell (2000), the principalship has gone through five evolutionary stages: one teacher (one-room school), head teacher, teaching principal, school principal, and supervising principal. The principalship is currently in a sixth stage, that of “change agent” (Malone & Caddell, 2000, p. 163).

To understand the history associated with school administration, one must revisit the Massachusetts law of 1647 that gave birth to the nation’s schools. Originally, selectmen were in charge of the schools, but growing problems dictated the creation of the first school board and the use of head teachers. The leader of a school that needed more than one teacher was the head teacher and was responsible for the opening and closing of school, obtaining supplies, scheduling classes, maintaining the building and communicating with parents, all while maintaining a full class load (Anderson & VanDyke, 1963).

These first school leaders or head teachers served as liaisons between teachers and their boards of education. This all changed with the creation of the first superintendency in 1837, and principals began reporting to superintendents who were charged to interact with school boards. According to Pierce (1935), this led to multiple departments within a

school (male, female, and primary), and each department had a separate “principal.”

Pierce described one instance as follows:

In many of the elementary buildings in the boroughs of Manhattan and the Bronx, it was found that two, or in some cases, three distinct school organizations under two or three independent principals existed under the same roof. As opportunity occurred, the Board of Superintendents recommended and . . . approved the recommendation, to consolidate three of these organizations into two, and two of them into one. (p. 10)

By 1847, The Quincy School in Boston was considered to be the first multi-roomed, graded school organized under one principal (Pierce, 1935).

The position of principal began to change with the enrollment of increasing numbers of students in the late 19th century. Principals began to teach less and to take on more administrative duties. An 1859 list of activities performed by the principal included: examination of classes, classification of students, promotion of students, conducting model lessons, and exercising careful supervision over the discipline and instruction of the whole school (Pierce, 1935). Gross and Herriott (1965) wrote that the first known, full time principals were located in New York in the late 1860s. At that time, the job duties of principals began to change from those of “presiding teacher to directing manager” .

At this time, most principals were still teaching and were generally referred to as “principal teachers” (Pierce, 1935, p. 11) According to Pierce, the principal-teachers functions were:

1) to function as the head of the school charged to his care; 2) to regulate the classes and course of instruction of all the pupils, whether they occupied his room or the rooms of other teachers, 3) to discover any defects in the school and apply remedies, 4) to make defects known to the visitor or trustee of ward, or district, if he were unable to remedy conditions, 5) to give necessary instruction to his

assistants, 6) to classify pupils, 7) to safeguard school houses and furniture, 8) to keep the school clean, 9) to instruct assistants, 10) to refrain from impairing the standing of assistants, especially in the eyes of their pupils, and 11) to require the cooperation of his assistants. (p. 12)

The early 20th century brought more respect and responsibility for the principals.

Over time, they were given more authority and were increasingly responsible for the selection and assignment of teachers. A New York City education policy (1899) reads: “No young teacher can be appointed to any school until after a time of probation, nor without the unequivocal recommendation of the principal” (Pierce, 1935).

In *The American High School*, Brown (1921) commented on the status and role of the principal as “ancient and honorable” (p. 224). He described the qualifications of a principal as “all of the qualifications of a teacher” (p. 224). Brown cited the following traits as those additionally desirable for principals: “(a) leadership, a good organizer and a manager of people; (b) knowledge; (c) self-confidence; (d) common sense; (e) understanding of human nature; (f) personality, honest, wise, sympathetic” (pp. 224-227). Brown also stated that the duties of the principal depended on the size of the school. In schools with fewer than six teachers, the superintendent essentially performed the duties of the principal. In such cases, the principal’s duties were confined to teaching and partial management of the school after it had been organized by the superintendent. The principal had little to do with the selection or supervision of teachers, and severe cases of discipline were referred to the superintendent (Brown, 1921).

A study conducted by the Seattle Principals Association, that contributed to the professionalism of the principalship took place in Seattle in 1919-1920. Seattle principals were asked to document their time for one week using a specially prepared

blank which made it possible to segregate the amounts of time devoted to the respective functions of their work. The researchers also designed a questionnaire based on information from 16 university professors which was used to create a list of the functions of a principal. This list of functions was then given to superintendents of large cities. They, in turn, reported the top three functions of their principals and the percentage of time devoted to each. The three most important categories of duties with which principals were tasked were rated as follows based on superintendents' expectations: supervision (50%), administration (20%), and clerical duties (10%). In reality, according to McClure (1921), principals spent about equal amounts of time on supervision and clerical duties.

The level of education that a principal needed has varied a great deal, especially in the early days of the principalship. In 1948, the United States Department of Education sent out questionnaires to 715 principals of which 461 were returned. Farmer created a status study of these results. He found that 97% of the 461 high school principals surveyed had a bachelor's degree, and 67% had a master's degree. Some 10 years later, in 1958, the National Education Association investigated the highest degrees earned by supervising principals. This study compared the highest degree earned in the years 1928, 1948, and 1958. The results are reproduced in Table 1. The percentages indicate the dramatic increase in education levels of principals between 1928 when a majority of principals had not earned an academic degree and 1948 when almost all principals possessed a bachelor's degree and a majority had earned master's degrees. By

1958, possession of a master’s degree had become the expected for many principals in 20th century schools.

Table 1

Highest Degree Earned by Supervising Principals 1928-1958

Degree	1928	1948	1958
No academic degree	54%	4%	2%
Bachelor’s degree	30%	29%	16%
Master’s degree	15%	64%	76%
Two-year diploma	--	--	2%
Doctor’s degree	1%	3%	3%

In the 1960s, academic requirements for principals still varied greatly by state. According to a study completed by Anderson and Van Dyke in 1963, some states still required less than a bachelor’s degree, and others required a master’s degree. In addition, some states required no teaching experience, but others required three years of experience in the classroom prior to be appointed as a principal (Anderson & Van Dyke, 1963).

In their educational administration text, Anderson and Van Dyke (1963) listed 20 duties that “the truly professional principal must be competent to perform” (pp. 10-11). The list revealed a diverse range of duties which included but were not limited to the following: curriculum planning, developing guidance and counseling services, management of transportation and cafeteria, development of student and faculty morale, providing in-service, and extra-curricular activities, building oversight, and encouraging involvement of the community.

In 1965, the National Association of Secondary Principals (NASSP) conducted a study of the principalship. The survey was designed to gather data under three categories: personal and professional characteristics of persons currently employed as principals; social, economic, political, and educational conditions which define the parameters under which principals must act; opinions and beliefs of principals about selected educational issues, practices, and tasks. Random samples of 1,600 high school principals were identified as the survey population. The data was stratified into categories based on: geographical region, type of community, size of school, type of school, and per pupil expenditure. It was found that the responding principals were primarily male and had been appointed to their first principalships in their early thirties (Byrne, Hines, & McCleary, 1978). In the survey, principals were asked to respond as to the importance of their preparation to their performance in five areas. The areas and percentages of important ratings by principals were as follows: supervision of instruction, 56%; human relations, 55%, secondary school organization, 45%, administrative practice and theory, 45%; and curriculum and program development, 45%.

The Evolution of Principal Preparation Programs

How to best prepare a person for a job in educational administration has always been a subject of debate. According to Levine (2005), from the earliest programs in 1890, three schools of thought emerged. James Earl Russell, Dean of Teacher's College, thought that preparation should be practitioner based and should be provided exclusively for experienced school leaders. The second camp was led by Holmes of Harvard who

believed that there should be a preparation model similar to those of the professions of law and medicine. Finally, Judd, in his *Introduction to the Scientific Study of Education*, pressed for the scholarly study of education (Levine, 2005).

Despite the controversy, or perhaps because of it, the evolution of training in school administration has been well documented. Hallinger and Murphy (1987) traced the development of school administration from 1865 to the mid-1980s, delineating major epochs which occurred over a century. Each epoch or stage brought its own changes to programs and theory in educational leadership. Table 2 shows the six time periods, the titles representing the stages, the accompanying philosophies, and the attention that was given to the preparation of administrators during each time period.

Table 2

Six Stages of School Administration: 1865-1985

Dates	Title	Philosophy	Training
1865-1900	Philosopher/Educator	Pedagogy, classics, Liberal Arts	Informal, teacher training
1900–1912	Educator/Capitalist	Business	Informal, teacher training
1913–1915	Business Manager	Mix of pedagogy, philosophy and efficacy	Beginnings of programs in educational administration
1915–1929	School Executive	Cost of efficiency; business methods	Formal, university- based
1930–1950	Social Agent	Social philosophy economics; democratic administration	Formal, required, university based
1950–1985	Behavioral Scientist	Behavioral, empirical	Formal; state-controlled, set credits for various licenses

Note. Adapted from. “Approaches to Administrative Training in Education,” by J. Murphy & P. Hallinger, 1987 .

Murphy (1998) categorized Educational Leadership Program development into four eras for a 200-year period starting in 1800 up to the present. His four categories (Ideal, Prescriptive, Behavioral, and Transitional) and the philosophy, type of training and important changes associated with each of the eras are displayed in Table 3.

Table 3

Four Eras of Administrator Preparation Program Development (1800-Present)

Dates	Era	Philosophy	Training	Important Changes
1820 - 1900	Ideal	Educational philosophy; principles of management	Rare/none	First leadership courses offered; Payne's chapters on school supervision (1875)
1900-1945	Prescriptive	Scientific management principles: standardization, specialization, synchronization, concentration, centralization	More common; lacked theoretical base; dominated by: facts, folklore, and personal experience	First doctorate offered by Harvard; states required certification
1946-1985	Behavioral	Theoretical knowledge from behavioral and social sciences embraced patriotic values and the importance of education to a democratic and strong society	Masters and Doctoral degrees	National Conference of Professors in Educational Administration; Cooperative Project in Educational Administration; University Council for Educational Administration
1986-present	Transitional/ Dialectic	Educational reform initiatives; focus on improving schools and student achievement	Masters and doctoral degrees	National Commission for Excellence in Educational Administration; Leaders' For America's Schools; NCATE

Note. Adapted from "Preparation for the School Principalship: The United States Story," by J. Murphy, 1998, *School Leadership and Management*, p. 360. Copyright 1998 by *School Leadership and Management*

Murphy (1998) regarded what he termed the Ideal Era of the 1800s as the period in which educational philosophy and principles of management emerged and the first leadership courses were offered. He viewed the first half of the 20th century as the Prescriptive Era in which the principles of scientific management were applied. This period led to increasing numbers of states requiring certification and was perceived to lack a theoretical base. The era from 1946 to 1985 was referred to as the Behavioral Era

and theoretical knowledge from the behavioral and social sciences were emphasized in masters and doctoral degree programs in schools of education. The mid-1980s to the present, according to Murphy (1998), has been an era of transition as colleges and universities have adjusted to reform initiatives.

By the 1980s, the preparation of school principals was determined to be inadequate. The National Commission on Excellence in Educational Administration published *Leaders for America's Schools* which sharply criticized administrator preparation programs, citing a need to (a) define educational leadership, (b) recruit promising candidates, (c) develop collaborative relationships with school district leadership, (d) encourage minorities and women to enter the field, and (e) make programs more current and clinical.

The next period in the evolution of Educational Leadership Programs came with involvement of and financial support from the Danforth Foundation in the late 1980s. The Danforth Foundation backed research of selected institutions that would lead to improved principal preparation programs. The Danforth Programs for the Preparation of School Principals began in 1987 with four university programs that grew to 22 over the next five years.

In 1992, a study was conducted by the Danforth Foundation to determine the extent to which universities being assisted by Danforth funds were benefiting from the change initiatives and graduating adequately prepared principals. Milstein (1993) conducted the evaluation in which the original 22 university programs were evaluated against a set of criteria. As a result of the initial review, five programs were chosen for

further study. These were the University of Alabama, the University of Central Florida, the University of Connecticut, California State University at Fresno, and the University of Washington. The results of the evaluation revealed three important lessons related to change. These, as determined by Milstein (1993), were (a) readiness, (b) program champions, and (c) partnerships. Readiness required that there be some doubt about the effectiveness of current efforts. Program champions referred to the need to have individuals who would push for the implementation of change in order to change the status quo. Partnerships with all stakeholders, i.e., faculty members, superintendents, central office staff, and site-based administrators, were viewed as vital.

Education has been in a constant state of change since the early 1980s, gaining momentum after the publication of *A Nation at Risk* (National Commission on Excellence in Education, 1983). Since that time, the pressure has increased for teachers and administrators to be more accountable and to be increasingly focused on student achievement. Increased emphasis on high stakes testing and the results of those tests had led to changes in the classroom for students and the ways in which administrators and teachers are evaluated. These changes have resulted in commensurate changes in the standards and competencies that guide both teacher and principal preparation programs.

In 1987, in response to many criticisms, the National Commission on Excellence in Educational Administration (1987) created by the University Council for Educational Administration (UCEA) identified problems in producing high quality educational administrators. In the commission's report, the following problems were cited: (a) inadequate definitions of good educational leadership; (b) lack of collaboration among

schools, colleges, and universities; (c) too few minorities and women in the field; (d) absence of systematic professional development; (e) poor quality of candidates for preparation programs; (f) irrelevance of preparation programs; (g) lack of licensure programs that promote excellence; and (h) absence of national cooperation in preparing school leaders. Typical recommendations in regard to this criticism were that the focus of preparation programs needed to be redirected towards instructional leadership, admission to preparation programs should be limited to qualified candidates, and field experiences should be increased so that learner outcomes would improve. (Darling-Hammond, Meyerson, LaPointe & Orr, 2010)

Contemporary Initiatives in Principal Preparation

For much of the 20th century, school leaders' responsibilities consisted of maintaining student safety, managing resources, and performing ceremonial duties (Herrington & Wills, 2005). Beck and Murphy (1993) identified the role of the modern principal as an instructional leader, problem solver, resource provider, visionary, and change agent. These changes in the role of the principal have led to increased pressure on principal preparatory programs (Hallinger, 2003). The demands of high stakes testing have led to heightened expectations and new skill sets needed by principals (Bottoms & O'Neil, 2001; Lashway, 2003).

Bottoms and O'Neil (2001) offered the following three suggestions regarding what principals in the first decade of the 21st century need to know:

1. which school and classroom practices contribute toward student achievement.

2. how to work with teachers and others to fashion and implement continuous school improvement.
3. how to provide the necessary support for our staff to carry out sound curriculum and instructional practices. (p. 2)

In the present climate of accountability and scarce resources, pressure to improve student achievement and make students' experiences relevant has not been limited to principals in K-12 schools. Colleges and universities have experienced the same kinds of challenges in providing leadership preparation programs that meet the needs of aspiring building level educational leaders.

Four categories of preparation program type emerged in the literature review. These include university-based programs, district-based programs, third-party professional development organization programs, and partnership programs (Barbour, 2005; Davis, Darling-Hammond, LaPointe, & Meyerson, 2005; Hale & Moorman, 2003).

District-based programs are developed and operated by school districts and may include collaboration with a third-party professional development organization (Barbour, 2005; Davis et al., 2005; Hale & Moorman, 2003). These programs have an advantage, with regard to other programs, in that a district is able to select candidates with natural leadership skills and offer curriculum that is district specific (Davis et al., 2005). Several of these programs, such as those at University of Washington and California State University, have been noted as particularly promising. These two programs were developed, and in part supported, by The Danforth Foundation (Jackson & Kelly, 2002). Though some district programs appear to be promising and are often welcomed in communities, Quennville (2007), in his review of three school divisions in Virginia, found that district-level programs did not show any evidence of preparing principals

better than traditional principal preparation programs. Quennville received surveys from 19 principals in the three districts who had successfully completed a district-level principal preparation program.

University and district partnerships are considered by many to create exemplary principal development (Browne-Ferrigno, 2011). These partnerships are sometimes mandated by governmental grants and encourage a university to partner with a district to create a more well-rounded principal. As one example, Kentucky recently changed its program approval requirements to require that all programs wishing to offer principal preparation programs submit proposals which require collaboration with districts. These proposals were required to include “(1) signed collaborative agreements with school districts that specify joint screening of principal candidates by both professors and practitioners and (2) evidence that district and university personnel codesigned and will codeliver courses” (Browne-Ferrigno, 2011, p. 742). Unfortunately, at present these new mandates are unfunded by the state government. Another example involving collaboration with districts by a university can be found at Portland State University where the intention has been to create a more coherent and integrated master’s program based on reimagined foundational principles of leadership and education. This new focus came as a result of efforts to align with national standards for leadership preparation, statewide education reforms, and opportunities for district collaboration. (Orr, 2006)

Third-party professional development organizations usually fall under one of three main types: (a) nonprofit organizations such as The Principal Residency Network (PRN), New Leaders for New Schools (NLNS), and the Wallace Foundation; (b) for-

profit organizations such as non-brick and mortar institutions including Capella and Strayer Universities; and (c) state-based alternative certification programs (Barbour, 2005; Davis et al., 2005; Hale & Moorman, 2003).

University-based programs are considered “traditional” and are based at a college or university. These programs generally offer master’s degrees in the area of educational leadership (Davis et al., 2005; Hale & Moorman, 2003). Historically, principal preparation programs have offered courses which address general management principles, school law, administrative requirements, and procedures (Copland, 1999; Elmore, 2000).

As criticisms have mounted that entry-level administrators are not ready to take on the new challenges of the principalship, university based principal preparation programs have come under increased scrutiny. Problems identified by critics are that traditional coursework fails to link theory with practice and is not aligned with established theories of leadership (American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education [AACTE], 2001; Copland, 1999; Elmore, 2000; Lumsden, 1992; McCarthy, 1999; Murphy & Vriesenga, 2004). It has been suggested that curricula be revised to include topics related to effective teaching and learning, the design of instruction and professional development, organizational design of schools that promote teacher and student learning.

There have been many studies and scholarly articles identifying specific issues with current university- based programs and their ability to adequately prepare students in the changing school environment. Levine (2005) called the current state of university-

based principal preparation programs “A race to the bottom” (p. 23). He listed four phenomena which he called “particularly troubling” (p. 23): (a) the rise of “off-campus” educational administration programs which are of lower quality and make use of an inordinate number of adjunct faculty; (b) master’s degree universities pushing to award doctoral degrees purely to gain stature, rendering such institutions as “credit dispensers” (p. 24); (c) a decline in program quality due to competition for students; and (d) state and school district incentives such as pay incentives for advanced degrees. In regard to the latter example, Levine believed the impact on students and universities to be a negative one which creates unmotivated students and universities who treat the programs as “cash cows” (p. 24).

Painter (2003) agreed that higher admission standards would improve principal preparation programs. She stated that higher admission standards would allow for more rigorous curricula and would result in candidates who are more able to take on the role of principal. Murphy (2006) another major researcher in the field, commented that issues for principal preparation programs were based on (a) a lack of foundation; (b) low admission requirements; (c) poor curriculum and an unwillingness to change; and (d) a lack of practice based learning (Murphy, 2006).

The argument has been made by Murphy, Moorman, & McCarthy (2008) that university programs hold research knowledge above practice knowledge. This leads graduates to create their own understandings from practice and “use stories heavily to improve their own action-oriented learning. It takes a heavy dose of academic arrogance

. . . to continue to marginalize important lessons forged in the field” (Murphy et.al, 2008, p. 582).

Levine (2005) conducted a study to investigate principal preparation program quality. In the study, he used nine criteria: purpose, curricular coherence, curricular balance, faculty composition, admissions, degrees, research, finances, and assessment. He questioned whether leadership programs include effective instruction on practice-based inquiry. Of the roughly 250,000 school and district level administrators he investigated, all were trained in schools of education and most in programs devoted to educational administration. Levine found that generally all university based programs offered similar coursework, usually referred to as “core” courses. These courses were heavy on pedagogy and low on practical application. In his study, Levine found that the nine most common courses offered to master’s level students were: instructional leadership; school law; educational psychology, curriculum development, research methods, historical and philosophical foundations in education, teaching and learning, child and adolescent development, and school principalship. These courses were found valuable by only 63% of principals in Levine’s study. In general, he found that principals were very critical of their preparation program with 89% of them saying that their programs had failed to adequately prepare them for their leadership roles.

Creating programs that are more closely linked to student success has been the focus of much of the contemporary research regarding principal preparation programs. The assumption has continued to be that improving school and student performance is directly impacted by the quality of leadership in the school. Christie, Thompson, and

Whitely (2009) were critical of the quality of educational leadership preparation programs and suggested six principles for achieving this quality. The two overarching principles suggested that (a) leadership and teacher quality not be separated and that (b) instructional leadership is the primary role of the principal. These were followed by (c) preservice programs need to be dramatically changed to attract greater numbers of potentially great people to the profession, (d) professional development should focus on grooming principals to be instructional leaders, (e) policies should ensure that mentoring and coaching happen on the job, and (f) continuous evaluation is key. The authors observed that three features of effective programs were content, methods, and structure (Christie et al., 2009).

Hale and Moorman (2003) had earlier commented on the needs of principals and the direction that should be taken by preparation programs:

Principals of today's schools must be able to (1) lead instruction, (2) shape an organization that demands and supports excellent instruction and dedicated learning by students and staff and (3) connect the outside world and its resources to the school and its work. As a corollary proposition, preparation programs must fulfill the vision embodied in the ISLLC standards and develop principals who have the knowledge, skills and attributes of an instructional leader and the capacity to galvanize the internal and external school communities in support of increased student achievement and learning (p. 10).

Unlike Christie et al. (2009), Hale and Moorman (2003) noted that there are excellent preparation programs that are anchored in research on teaching and learning and the role of the principal as an instructional leader.

One common feature that has been recognized as being particularly valuable in most preparation programs has been the internship. A well-developed internship provides a wealth of opportunities not available within the scope of a traditional

classroom (Capasso & Daresh, 2001). Unlike student teachers, who are expected to be full practitioners during their internships, many administrative interns receive no real administrative practice at all during their internships (Edmundson, 2002). In a report prepared for The Southern Regional Education Board, Fry, Bottoms, and O'Neill (2005) addressed the quality of field experiences in Educational Leadership Programs. They described a good internship program as "a sturdy vessel upon which new practitioners can navigate the swift, unpredictable currents that separate classroom theory and on-the-job reality" (Fry et al., p. 3). Unfortunately, in the same publication the internship vessel was also referred to as "leaky, rudderless or still in dry dock" (Fry et al., p. 3)

Most Educational Leadership Programs include some form of an internship so as to provide students the opportunity to put theory into practice. However these internships vary across the country. The number of hours required to complete the internships can vary from two to 15 credit hours. Some universities require a year-long, full time commitment from their students, and interns spend an entire school year working in a school. Others require as little as 90 days. (Levine, 2005; Orr, 2009) Universities requiring an entire academic year sometimes partner with districts to help subsidize the program. Unlike business and industry where paid internships are relatively common, schools have not elected, or been able, however, to dedicate the necessary financial resources to support such programs. They have relied upon higher education institutions to provide the initial preparation leading to administrative certification and on-the-job training and professional development to support entry-level administrators. Though many students, if given the option, would prefer a full-time paid apprenticeship, these

opportunities has been almost non-existent in education. Thus, most higher education institutions require that their master's level students complete a part-time, one semester commitment while continuing to work full-time. This leads to a drastic difference in preparation of new leaders.

This part-time administrative experience, completed prior to students completing their programs and being fully qualified, is problematic in some respects, because students cannot be delegated any true responsibility during their internships. Working full-time, interning part-time and being supervised by busy administrators all lead to an uneven quality of experience dependent upon multiple factors and conditions in the internship setting. According to Edmondson (2003), this situation can lead to a focus on not overburdening either the intern or the supervising administrator with too much "extra" work. Still, upon completion of their programs and once officially certificated by their respective states, graduates are expected to be ready to step into various leadership roles.

Educational Leadership Programs have been criticized for their lax admission requirements. Many university programs allow students to self-select and admit all students who apply for their programs who meet basic university graduate school admission requirements. This attitude prompted Murphy in 1992 to call out his colleagues for their "informal, haphazard, and casual" (p. 80) approach to program admission. In 1987, the National Commission on Excellence in Educational Administration cited careful selection of program entrants as critically important, and two

years later the National Policy Board for Educational Administration (NPBEA) reissued the stance.

Painter (2003), in describing concern over admission standards used an old computer adage of “garbage in/garbage out” to describe her concern over admission standards. Though critical, Painter also pointed out raising admission standards was unlikely due to the financial impact on universities. She stated that those who are rejected from one program will likely be accepted to another program with lower admission standards. These students would take their tuition dollars with them. Painter posited that the problem was not in admitting too many students into the program. Rather, she suggested that having a large group admitted does not necessarily mean they will all have to graduate. Having rigorous coursework and frequent feedback can help students realize when they are not well-suited to the job.

Among the many aspects to be addressed in regard to being more selective in admitting students into Educational Leadership Programs are the lower number of students who would be in a program and the impact on resources. Lower numbers of students would likely reduce funding and the number of fulltime professors. Since most college or university departments of educational administration have fewer than six members, the loss of a full time professor would be a definite deterrent to putting in place selection criteria that might impact faculty resources (McCarthy, 1999).

According to Davis et al. (2005), the process and standards by which many principal preparatory programs screen, select, and graduate candidates are often ill-defined, irregularly applied, and lacking in rigor. These researchers expressed the belief

that many aspiring administrators are too easily admitted into and passed through programs on the basis of completed coursework rather than on a comprehensive assessment of the knowledge, skills, and dispositions needed to successfully lead schools. Creighton and Jones conducted a study in 2001 of existing selection criteria and procedures in university principal preparation programs, surveying and reviewing 450 master's degree and principal certification programs in the United States. In their study, they found it alarming that 60% of programs allowed students to complete a graduate degree program in educational administration without the teaching experience required for certification as an administrator.

At various times during the evolution of administrator preparation programs, there has been a shortage of administrators, and colleges and universities have been challenged to respond to a need for additional personnel in the nation's schools at various levels. At the present time, the perceived shortage is not in numbers of certificated administrators but in the availability of "qualified" candidates who have completed programs and are judged to be ready to assume increasingly sophisticated leadership roles in schools.

In the literature reviewed, three types of problems were found to contribute to this perceived shortage. First, traditional administrative preparation programs do not attract sufficient numbers of quality candidates who are committed to leadership roles *where* they are needed (Knapp, Copland, & Talbert, 2003). Next, even when high-potential candidates are found, working conditions, especially in high-poverty urban schools, can impede the number of recruits. Perceived lack of opportunities for advancement can also contribute to a thin pool of qualified applicants for building leadership positions. Finally,

principals are often ill-prepared and inadequately supported to take on the work of instructional leadership and school improvement. Winter, Rinehart, & Munoz (2001) found that candidates' self-perceptions of their ability were the strongest predictor of their willingness to apply for a principalship. As a result, reformers suggested that recruiting the right people, preparing them comprehensively, and supporting them as they lead schools is essential to improve the pool of school leaders.

In their study, Orr and Orphanos (2007) determined that leadership preparation had a significant influence on how leaders lead. Orr and Orphanos conducted a research study in 2005 in which they compared surveys of 65 principals who had graduated from one of four exemplary principal preparation programs to a national sample of 111 principals. They found that

Participation in an exemplary leadership preparation program was significantly associated with learning about effective leadership and engaging in these practices, particularly where stronger preparation program and internship quality existed. Frequent use of effective leadership practices was positively associated with school improvement progress and school effectiveness climate. Taken together, exemplary leadership preparation had a positive but mediated influence on variations in school improvement progress and school effectiveness climate; the relationship was even stronger when focusing on preparation program and internship quality measures. (p. 19)

Researchers studying effective programs have also found that principal preparation delivered through university-district collaborations can improve the quality and relevance of program content and support career advancement of graduates (Grogan & Robertson, 2002; Orr & Barber, 2006; Young, Petersen, & Short, 2002).

In her 2006 study, Orr found that many schools of education have completely changed their programs in an effort to meet the changing needs of their graduates. She

based her study on extensive research in the field as well as examples of innovative programs from published and unpublished works (Orr, 2006). She reported innovations as follows:

- (a) reinterpretation of leadership as pivotal for improving teaching and learning;
- (b) new insights into how program content, pedagogy, and field-based learning experiences can be designed to be more powerful means of preparing leaders;
- (c) redesign of the doctorate as an intensive midcareer professional development activity;
- (d) use of partnerships for richer, more extensive program design opportunities; and
- (e) commitment for continuous improvement. (pp. 492-493)

According to Orr, some critics are unsure of the ability of schools of education to overcome the strong institutional forces that fight change. Keeping program costs low seems to override their ability or willingness to adopt any significant reform. Orr alluded to the position of the U.S. Department of Education, indicating that leadership preparation programs need to be more innovative and need to include intensively focused components and authentic course and fieldwork.

Additionally, Orr (2006) called for principal preparation programs to focus on three important principles she had found to be important in order to move in a more positive direction. First, programs need to have a clear vision that includes articulated, fundamental principles. Next, this vision should be used to depart from the traditional focus on educational leadership. Finally, these programs must be inventive in how they give their vision coherence in terms of the selection of students, program design, content, field experiences, and assessment (Orr, 2006).

Regional and National Influences on Principal Preparation Programs

Over the years, various experts and regional and national agencies have influenced the development of Educational Leadership Programs by issuing standards, guidelines or treatises on the state of the principalship or educational leadership preparation. In this section of the literature review, the contributions of several important influences on the University of Central Florida's Master of Education in Educational Leadership Program are discussed.

Southern Regional Education Board (SREB)

What makes a good principal? That question has been the focus of much discussion throughout the entire history of the principalship and the concerns of states and schools of education responsible for preparation programs and certification requirements. The Southern Regional Education Board (SREB) was founded in 1948 by southern governors to help government and education officials work more cooperatively to further education in their areas (SREB, 2012). States represented in SREB at the time of the present study were Alabama, Arkansas, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Mississippi, North Carolina, Oklahoma, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia, and West Virginia.

SREB has defined as its mission to help SREB states lead the nation in educational progress and has created a learning-centered leadership program to assist states and districts in redesigning educational leadership preparation and professional development programs. In their study conducted for SREB, Bottoms and O'Neill (2001)

identified the following 13 critical success factors organized under three overarching competencies, all of which are perceived to be essential to good leadership associated with increased student achievement:

Competency I: Effective principals have a comprehensive understanding of school and classroom practices that contribute to student achievement.

1. Focusing on student achievement
2. Developing a culture of high expectations
3. Designing a standards-based instructional system

Competency II: Effective principals have the ability to work with teachers and others to design and implement continuous student improvement.

4. Creating a caring environment
5. Implementing data-based improvement
6. Communicating
7. Involving parents

Competency III: Effective principals have the ability to provide the necessary support for staff to carry out sound school, curriculum and instructional practices.

8. Initiating and managing change
9. Providing professional development
10. Innovating
11. Maximizing resources
12. Building external support
13. Staying abreast of effective practices (Bottoms & O'Neil, 2001)

Education Commission of the States (ECS)

The Education Commission of the States (ECS) was created in 1965 by John W. Gardner, President of the Carnegie Corporation and Terry Sanford, former Governor of North Carolina. The goal was to create a place where each state could learn about the activities of all states with regard to education (Education Commission of the States, 2012). In 2009, The Education Commission of the States created a model policy outlining the competencies, knowledge, and skills that a principal should possess in order to be licensed. The policy provided clear guidelines as to what a principal preparation program should do to adequately prepare its graduates.

The ECS policy was concerned with programs ensuring competency in four domains: setting direction and sustaining the vision, building relationships, leading and managing instruction and further developing the organization. The policy also stated that programs (a) should incorporate hands-on training in schools for no less than 30% of the program, (b) that 75% of instruction should be delivered by faculty who had served as “at least” a principal, and (c) that training in adult supervision and continuous feedback should be provided.

The ECS policy also called for students completing administrator preparation programs to demonstrate knowledge of significant school-level practices, including: (a) alignment and coherence of curriculum, instruction and assessment; (b) monitoring progress and evaluating the effectiveness of school practices and their impact on student learning; (c) optimizing schools by inspiring and leading new and challenging innovations; and (d) instructional time. Finally, the ECS policy called for demonstrated mastery of the distinct research-based leadership responsibilities and 66 associated practices to improve student achievement (Christie et al., 2009).

U. S. Department of Education

The U.S. Department of Education (2005), seeking to “improve the quality and equity of education opportunities” (p. 1) identified 10 common features of excellence in principal preparation programs. They were:

1. An initial base of support that includes partnerships with key stakeholders and funders to finance “start-up” costs of planning, development, and early implementation.

2. A commitment on the part of program developers to do the extremely hard work of developing, establishing, and implementing the program over a minimum of three to five years.
3. A research-based vision of what an effective principal does to lead instructional improvement and student achievement gains.
4. A focused theory of action about program development and instructional designed based on the vision.
5. School leadership performance standards and outcome assessments aligned with the vision and theory of action.
6. Candidate selection criteria and screening process that reflects the vision and the capability of the program.
7. Structuring participant groups into continuing cohorts that frequently meet to discuss what they are experiencing and learning about the principal's job.
8. Authentic learning experiences that incorporate on-the-job, practical realities of principal's work.
9. Frequent structured opportunities for participants to do personal reflection and performance assessment.
10. Structured program monitoring and assessment through feedback, participants' performance in the program and participants' success on the job after the program. (p. 29)

The Education Schools Project

In 2005, Levine, on behalf of the Education Schools Project, released *Educating School Leaders*, a report that evaluated how well schools of education were preparing school leaders for the current job they were expected to perform. This study used a nine point template for judging the quality of school leadership programs which provides insight into those programmatic components considered to be important at the time of the study. Included were the following nine programmatic elements:

Purpose: The program's purpose is explicit, focusing on the education of practicing school leaders; the goals reflect the needs of today's leaders, schools, and children; and the definition of success is tied to student learning in the schools administered by the graduates of the program.

Curricular coherence: The curriculum mirrors program purposes and goals. The curriculum is rigorous, coherent, and organized to teach the skills and knowledge needed by leaders at specific types of schools and at the various stages of their careers

Curricular balance: The curriculum integrates the theory and practice of administration, balancing study in university classrooms and work in schools with successful practitioners.

Faculty composition: The faculty includes academics and practitioners, ideally the same individuals, who are expert in school leadership, up to date in their field, intellectually productive, and firmly rooted in both the academy and the schools. Taken as a whole, the faculty's size and fields of expertise are aligned with the curriculum and student enrollment

Admissions: Admissions criteria are designed to recruit students with the capacity and motivation to become successful school leaders.

Degrees: Graduation standards are high and the degrees awarded are appropriate to the profession.

Research: Research carried out in the program is of high quality, driven by practice, and useful to practitioners and/or policy makers.

Finances: Resources are adequate to support the program.

Assessment: The program engages in continuing self-assessment and improvement of its performance. (Levine, 2005, p. 13)

Although Levine's study was comprehensive with respect to educational leadership preparation programs, the following recommendations from the report were salient to initial preparation programs, i.e., principal preparation programs:

1. School systems, municipalities, and states must find alternatives to salary scales that grant raises merely for accumulating credits and degrees.
2. Universities must champion high standards for education schools and their leadership programs by embracing financial practices that strengthen those programs.
3. All leadership programs should be rigorously evaluated, and weak programs should be strengthened or closed.
4. The current grab bag of courses that constitutes preparation for a career in educational leadership must give way to relevant and challenging curriculum designed to prepare effective school leaders. A new degree, the Master's in Educational Administration, should be developed.
5. The doctor of education degree (Ed.D) in school leadership should be eliminated.
6. The doctor of philosophy degree (Ph.D) in school leadership should be reserved for preparing researchers. (pp. 63-67)

National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE)

The National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) was launched in 1954 by a coalition of professional organizations from across the national education community. It is comprised of teachers, teacher educators, content specialists, and local and state policy makers. Although NCATE accreditation is voluntary, some states, Florida being one, have chosen to require all state teacher education institutions to be NCATE accredited. Undergraduate programs are referred to as initial programs. Graduate programs are referred to as advanced programs.

Principal preparation programs are accredited by NCATE as advanced programs and must follow the guidelines set out by the organization in order to attain and maintain accreditation. After attaining initial accreditation through self-study and program assessment, institutions must be reaccredited every seven years. This involves a repetition of the self-study and assessment of the program, a site visit to validate findings in the self-study, a determination of accreditation status, and annual follow-up. The process is cyclical and is designed to hold programs accountable for the quality of their graduates.

Conceptual Framework

The Master of Education in Educational Leadership Program at the University of Central Florida has been guided by the standards, competencies, and certification requirements of various state, regional, and national agencies. It is these varied criteria that comprise the conceptual framework for this study. This study was conducted

primarily to examine the extent to which the program was aligned with five sets of standards so as to determine any gaps that may exist. Included are standards of (a) the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE/Educational Leadership Constituent Council (ELCC), (b) the Interstate School Leader Licensure Consortium (ISLLC), (c) the Florida Educator Accomplished Practices (FEAPs), (d) the Florida Principal Leadership Standards (FPLS), and (e) the Florida Educational Leadership Examination (FELE). These standards and competencies are explained, discussed, and summarized in the following sections. Complete documentation detailing the five sets of standards is contained in the appendices of this document.

Educational Leadership Constituent Council (ELCC)

The standards used by NCATE to judge the quality of an Educational Leadership Program are those of the Educational Leadership Constituent Council (ELCC). The ELCC standards were created by the National Policy Board for Educational Administration (NPBEA), which is a national consortium of major stakeholders in educational leadership and policy (Young, n.d). The first set of NCATE approved *Guidelines for Advanced Programs in Educational Leadership* were first formulated in 1995. These standards were then rewritten in 2002 and further revised in 2011.

The Educational Leadership Constituent Council developed standards that have been used in the evaluation of university preparation programs seeking National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) accreditation (Adkins, 2009). The NCATE/ELCC Standards are also used by numerous states to approve administrator

preparation programs for certification (Davis & Jazzar, 2005; The State Consortium on Education Leadership, 2008). These standards were scaffolded directly on the ISLLC standards (Murphy, 2005). The NCATE/ELCC standards are presented in two categories applicable to administrators at the (a) building and (b) district levels: Following are the basic seven building level administrator standards to which the UCF Master of Education in Educational Leadership will be aligned. Complete information regarding the standards is contained in Appendix B.

*Educational Leadership Constituent Council (ELCC)
Building Level Standards–2011*

1. A building-level education leader applies knowledge that promotes the success of every student by collaboratively facilitating the development, articulation, implementation, and stewardship of a shared school vision of learning through the collection and use of data to identify school goals, assess organizational effectiveness, and implement school plans to achieve school goals; promotion of continual and sustainable school improvement; and evaluation of school progress and revision of school plans supported by school-based stakeholders.
2. A building-level education leader applies knowledge that promotes the success of every student by sustaining a school culture and instructional program conducive to student learning through collaboration, trust, and a personalized learning environment with high expectations for students; creating and evaluating a comprehensive, rigorous and coherent curricular and instructional school program; developing and supervising the instructional and leadership capacity of school staff; and promoting the most effective and appropriate technologies to support teaching and learning within a school environment.
3. A building-level education leader applies knowledge that promotes the success of every student by ensuring the management of the school organization, operation, and resources through monitoring and evaluating the school management and operational systems; efficiently using human, fiscal, and technological resources in a school environment; promoting and protecting the welfare and safety of school students and staff; developing school capacity for distributed leadership; and ensuring that teacher and

organizational time is focused to support high-quality instruction and student learning.

4. A building-level education leader applies knowledge that promotes the success of every student by collaborating with faculty and community members, responding to diverse community interests and needs, and mobilizing community resources on behalf of the school by collecting and analyzing information pertinent to improvement of the school's educational environment; promoting an understanding, appreciation, and use of the diverse cultural, social, and intellectual resources within the school community; building and sustaining positive school relationships with families and caregivers; and cultivating productive school relationships with community partners.
5. A building-level education leader applies knowledge that promotes the success of every student by acting with integrity, fairness, and in an ethical manner to ensure a school system of accountability for every student's academic and social success by modeling school principles of self-awareness, reflective practice, transparency, and ethical behavior as related to their roles within the school; safeguarding the values of democracy, equity, and diversity within the school; evaluating the potential moral and legal consequences of decision making in the school; and promoting social justice within the school to ensure that individual student needs inform all aspects of schooling.
6. A building-level education leader applies knowledge that promotes the success of every student by understanding, responding to, and influencing the larger political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context through advocating for school students, families, and caregivers; acting to influence local, district, state, and national decisions affecting student learning in a school environment; and anticipating and assessing emerging trends and initiatives in order to adapt school-based leadership strategies.
7. A building-level education leader applies knowledge that promotes the success of every student through a substantial and sustained educational leadership internship experience that has school-based field experiences and clinical internship practice within a school setting and is monitored by a qualified, on-site mentor (National Policy Board for Educational Administration, 2011).

Interstate School Leader Licensure Consortium (ISLLC)

The National Policy Board for Educational Administration (NPBEA) created the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) in 1994 under the auspices of the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO) to develop standards for educational

leadership in anticipation of the needs of 21st century administrators (Adkins, 2009). ISLLC is a collaborative group with a collective interest in the field of educational leadership. Included in the consortium were representatives of states, professional associations, and universities (Murphy, 2001; Wiedmer, 2007). Universities were represented in the consortium by the University Council for Educational Administration (UCEA) and the National Council of Professors of Educational Administration (NCPEA). Associations were represented by the National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP), the National Association of Elementary School Principals (NAESP), the American Association of School Administrators (AASA), and the Association for Curriculum and Development (ASCD). In addition to the groups represented, approximately 27 states had representation (Davis & Jazzar, 2005; Murphy 2001).

One interest of the consortium was ensuring adequate preparation of students prior to their being certified through their states' licensure programs. To accomplish this, the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium created the ISLLC standards in 1996 which have since been used by many states to guide principal preparation programs and licensure (Wilmore, 2002). In 2008, these standards were updated and proposed to serve as guidelines for all states, not just members of the original consortium. All states have been encouraged to use these standards as a guide for creating their leadership standards and certification programs.

The 2008 ISLLC Standards were designed to drive training and preparation programs by establishing performance expectations. They also lent themselves to

curriculum development, candidate assessment, and accountability. These standards have directly impacted NCATE's accreditation process and the program standards that guide the organization's work. In addition, the National Policy Board for Educational Administration has been reviewing its 2002 Standards for Advanced Programs in Educational Administration to align them with the 2008 ISLLC standards. The seven standards put forth by ISLCC in 2008 are presented in brief. Complete information related to the standards is provided in Appendix C.

1. The administrator has an understanding of and demonstrates competence in the teacher standards.
2. A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by facilitating the development, articulation, implementation, and stewardship of a vision of learning that is shared and supported by the school community.
3. The administrator manages by advocating, nurturing, and sustaining a school culture and instructional program conducive to pupil learning and staff professional growth.
4. The administrator ensures management of the organization, operations, finances, and resources for a safe, efficient, and effective learning environment.
5. The administrator models collaborating with families and community members, responding to diverse community interests and needs, and mobilizing community resources.
6. The administrator acts with integrity, fairness, and in an ethical manner.
7. The administrator understands, responds to, and interacts with the larger political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context that affects schooling. (Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium, 2008, pp. 14-15)

Most states have adopted some form of the ISLLC standards as the basis for their principal standards. According to Sanders and Simpson's 2004 survey, 46 states had leadership standards. Of these, 41 had adopted the ISLLC standards or ensured that they were aligned. Most of these were adopted prior to the No Child Left Behind (NCLB)

legislation. Standards passed since 2004 show a continued reliance on the ISLLC standards.

Several states have adopted educational leadership standards that are more closely aligned with NCLB. Alabama's standards specifically reference assessment and accountability regarding student learning and also diversity, (Alabama State Department of Education Administrative Code, 2005). Florida, in finalizing its revised 2005 educational leadership standards, included standards in instructional leadership, operational leadership, and school leadership. Within those three categories, Florida addressed diversity, accountability and assessment (Florida State Board of Education Rules, Chapter B6-5).

One aspect of the state licensure process is assessment. There are currently three assessment models used by states. The first model, used in Iowa, Montana, Nebraska, Vermont, Rhode Island, and Alaska, requires an assessment as part of graduation requirements. The second model calls for performance-based assessments that are completed during the internship portion of the masters' program. Louisiana, as one example, requires a passing score on the ISLLC Portfolio Assessment (Louisiana Board of Elementary and Secondary Education, 2005). California, Colorado, Delaware, and Ohio also require assessments during the induction program. The third model is a written assessment which is separate and distinct from the education process. A majority of the states fit in this category, Florida being one. At the time of the present study, 15 states required candidates to pass the School Leadership Licensure Assessment (SLLA) which is ISLLC based and purports to assess administrators in a variety of areas including

teaching and learning. The majority of states that have implemented a written assessment since NCLB require the SLLA (Roach, Smith, & Boutin, 2007).

Florida Educator Accomplished Practices (FEAPs)

The Florida Educator Accomplished Practices (FEAPs) were established in 1998 by State Board of Education rule 6A-5.065. These standards were updated in 2010 to reflect changes in current research and trends. The standards are used as the foundation for teacher preparation programs, educator certification requirements, and school district instructional personnel appraisal systems. (FLDOE, 2012)

The FEAPs, as of February 13, 2011, were based on three foundational principles: high expectations, knowledge of subject matter, and standards of the profession. The practices have been clearly stated in order to create a common language. The accomplished practices address both the quality of instruction and continuous improvement, responsibility and ethics (FLDOE, 2012). Considered in quality of instruction are practices demonstrating educators' knowledge and skills related to (a) instructional design and lesson planning, (b) the learning environment, (c) instructional delivery and facilitation, and (d) assessment. Continuous improvement and responsibility and ethics contain detailed practices that demonstrate educators' attentiveness to improvement and their professional responsibility in adhering to high moral standards in a community. The complete listing of the accomplished practices is included in Appendix D.

Florida Principal Leadership Standards (FPLS)

Florida recognized the need for explicit principal leadership standards as early as 1980. The Management Training Act stated:

The legislature recognizes that quality education in the public schools of this state requires excellence in its principals and other managers. Efficient and effective management of schools to meet the needs of students in today's society requires a unique blend of skills, experience and academic background which is rarely provided through typical baccalaureate or graduate programs in education. The purpose of this section is to provide for a state, regional, and district support system for excellence in principals and other educational managers. This support system shall include the identification of those competencies basic to effective management of schools; a performance-based management training program; a program of competency-based certification for school managers to become effective July 1, 1986; a performance-based evaluation and compensation program for educational managers. It is further intended that this section encourage career development, inservice training, and skills enhancement for present and potential education managers (Florida Department of Education, 1993a, p. 55).

The Management Training Act originally outlined 19 competencies. In April, 2005, the Florida Principal Leadership Standards replaced the Florida Competencies, State Board of Education (SBE) 6B-5.0012. They serve as the state's standards that Florida school leaders must demonstrate in preparation programs and in school administrator evaluations. Florida Principal Leadership Standards were adopted into rule (6 A-5.080) by the State Board in 2006-07, and Educational Leadership and School Principal Certification programs were redesigned to implement the new standards in 2008. Florida's standards for leadership communicate to teachers, principals, and parents the vision and standards for effective educational leadership in Florida. The Florida Principal Leadership Standards guide principals' leadership of the state's schools and impact leadership preparation programs, the Florida Educational Leadership Examination

(FELE), principal professional development programs, and principal recruitment, selection, and evaluation programs (Florida Department of Education, 2012).

The most recent revision of the FPLS occurred in 2011. The Florida Race to the Top Teacher and Leader Preparation Implementation Committee (TLPIC) was composed of teachers and school leaders from postsecondary institutions and school districts, district administrators, superintendents, and school board members. This committee was responsible for revising the FPLS to align with contemporary research on effective school leadership. The committee initially met on May 9-10, 2011 in Ocala, Florida. This group worked over the next two months to develop an initial draft of the revised FPLS using the research base presented to them by Drs. Douglas Reeves and Raymond Smith from The Leadership and Learning Center, a division of Houghton Mifflin, located in Englewood, Colorado. The TLPIC also presented its initial draft to a subcommittee of William Cecil Golden Program partners and other postsecondary and school district leadership preparation representatives, and received feedback and suggestions to consider. The Florida Department of Education and the TLPIC then considered the public input, revised the draft standards, and held a rule development workshop in fall of 2011. After the Commissioner of Education's review and revision, the proposed draft standards were presented to the State Board of Education for consideration for adoption into State Board Rule (Florida Department of Education, 2012). The new standards were adopted by SBE Rule 6A-5.080 on November 15, 2011.

The revised standards reflected a number of changes. The previously adopted standards numbered 10 and included: vision; instructional leadership; managing the

learning environment; community and stakeholder partnerships; decision making strategies; diversity; technology; learning, accountability, and assessment; human resources; and ethical leadership (Florida Department of Education, 2005). The revised standards were streamlined and organized under three domains: students' achievement, instructional leadership, and organizational leadership (Florida Principal Leadership Standards, 2011). Table 4 contains the domains and standards as revised. Further detail regarding the standards is contained in Appendix E.

Table 4

Florida Principal Leadership Standards (2011)

Domain	Domain Descriptors
Domain 1: Student Achievement	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Student Learning Results: Effective school leaders achieve results on the school’s student learning goals. 2. Student Learning as a Priority: Effective school leaders demonstrate that student learning is their top priority through leadership actions that build and support a learning organization focused on student success
Domain 2: Instructional Leadership	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. Instructional Plan Implementation: Effective school leaders work collaboratively to develop and implement an instructional framework that aligns curriculum with state standards, effective instructional practices, student learning needs and assessments. 4. Faculty Development: Effective school leaders recruit, retain and develop an effective and diverse faculty and staff. 5. Learning Environment: Effective school leaders structure and monitor a school learning environment that improves learning for all of Florida’s diverse student population.
Domain 3: Organizational Leadership	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 6. Decision Making: Effective school leaders employ and monitor a decision-making process that is based on vision, mission and improvement priorities using facts and data. 7. Leadership Development: Effective school leaders actively cultivate, support, and develop other leaders within the organization. 8. School Management: Effective school leaders manage the organization, operations, and facilities in ways that maximize the use of resources to promote a safe, efficient, legal and effective learning environment. 9. Communication: Effective school leaders practice two-way communications and use appropriate oral, written, and electronic communication and collaboration skills to accomplish school and system goals by building and maintaining relationships with students, faculty, parents, and community.
Domain 4: Professional and Ethical Behavior	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 10. Professional and Ethical Behaviors – Effective school leaders demonstrate personal and professional behaviors consistent with quality practices in education and as a community leader.

Florida Educational Leadership Examination (FELE)

As part of the 1979 Florida Management Training Act, all prospective school administrators needed to pass a competency examination (Office of Program Policy Analysis and Government Accountability, 2000). The Florida Educational Leadership Examination (FELE) is a test that has been administered by a division of Pearson

Publishing for the Florida Department of Education. This examination is one of the requirements for certification in Educational Leadership in the state of Florida. It is based on Florida Department of Education rule. The test was updated in 2008 in order to adopt the current competencies (Florida Department of Education, 2005). The FELE was originally designed to test those individuals seeking certification in three areas: (a) school communications, (b) school management, and (c) school operations. These were changed, effective January 1, 2009, to contain three subtests addressing: (a) instructional leadership, (b) operational leadership, and (c) school leadership. The subtests and component parts presented in Table 5 provide insight into the component parts of the FELE. Complete detail related to the examination is provided in Appendix F.

Table 5

Florida Educational Leadership Examination 2009: Subtests and Components

Subtests	Subtest Components
1. Instructional Leadership	Instructional Leadership Managing the Learning Environment Learning, Accountability and Assessment
2. Operational Leadership	Technology Human Resources Development Ethical Leadership Decision-making Strategies
3. School Leadership	Community and Stakeholder Partnerships Diversity Vision Written Performance Assessment

The University of Central Florida's Principal Preparation Program

During the 1960s, there was an increasing demand for educational institutions in Central Florida. Many electronics and engineering companies were moving into the Central Florida area, including the Martin Company and Kennedy Space Center. These companies needed local universities for their employees to pursue advanced studies. The only universities in the area at that time were Rollins College and Orlando Junior College, and neither offered advanced studies in electronics or engineering (Sheinkopf, 1976).

The University of Central Florida opened its doors as Florida Technological University with 1,948 students, having been founded by an act of legislation in June of 1963. The University opened on September 16, 1966 with schools of business administration, education, arts and sciences, engineering, and general education (Sheinkopf, 1976). Soon after the university began offering classes in 1968, the College of Education added an Educational Leadership Program, originally referred to as Administration and Supervision. Initially, only master's degrees were offered by UCF; however, UCF, in partnership with the University of Florida (UF) and Florida Atlantic University (FAU) began to offer specialist and Doctor of Education (Ed.D.) degrees between the years of 1968 and 1986 (Humphrey, 2003).

On December 6, 1978, the name of the institution was changed to the University of Central Florida by the Florida Legislature to more accurately reflect the university's mission (University of Central Florida, 2012). The mission of UCF's College of Education as stated on its website is "to provide a high-quality education for its

undergraduate students, graduate students and others as reflective practitioners, to promote and conduct research and scholarship, and to participate in learning communities that enhance practice and student outcomes (University of Central Florida, 2012).

By fall 2011, the university's student population had grown to 58,698 (University of Central Florida, 2012). At the time of the present study, the university was comprised of 13 colleges: Arts and Humanities, The Burnett Honors College, Business Administration, Education, Engineering and Computer Science, Graduate Studies, Health and Public Affairs, Medicine, Nursing, Optics and Photonics, Hospitality Management, Sciences, and Interdisciplinary Studies (University of Central Florida, 2012).

The UCF Educational Leadership Program has a distinguished history, having received substantial recognition and awards since its inception. In the 1990s, the Master of Education in Educational Leadership Program was awarded funding by the Danforth Foundation, and cohorts were established to permit students to move through the program as a group. The success of the UCF-Danforth Foundation partnership was chronicled in *Changing the Way We Prepare Leaders: The Danforth Experience* (Milstein, 1993). In 2003, the Educational Leadership Program received \$1.1 million to host the Progress Energy-UCF Leadership Institute, directed by Drs. William Bozeman and Rosemarye Taylor.

The UCF Masters in Education in Educational Leadership Program is intended for those individuals who wish to work in leadership or administrative careers in education and provides theoretical and conceptual knowledge for Florida certification (University of Central Florida, 2012). The courses that are required for the Master of Education

degree (M.Ed.) are designed to address the competency domains specified by the Florida Department of Education and included in the Florida Educational Leadership Examination (FELE). Students are required to pass all parts of the FELE in order to graduate.

The UCF Educational Leadership Masters Degree program currently requires that students complete all coursework and complete an internship. As shown in Table 6, the courses are separated into three areas which include a nine-hour core, a foundational course, a 27-hour specialization, and a three-hour administrative internship.

Table 6

UCF Educational Leadership Program of Study: M. Ed. in Educational Leadership

Areas of Study	Required Courses
Core (9 credit hours)	EDF 6432 Measurement and Evaluation in Education (3) EDF 6481 Fundamentals of Graduate Research in Education (3) One additional educational foundations course (3)
Specialization (27 credit hours)	EDA 6061 Organization and Administration of Schools* (3) EDA 6232 Legal Aspects of School Operation* (3) EDA 6240 Educational Financial Affairs* (3) EDA 6260 Educational Systems Planning and Management* (3) EDA 6931 Contemporary Issues in Educational Leadership* (3) EDS 6123 Educational Supervisory Practices I* (3) EDS 6130 Educational Supervisory Practices II* (3) EDA 6300 Community School Administration (3) EDA 6502 Organization and Administration of Instructional Programs (3)
Internship (3 credit hours)**	EDA 6946 Graduate Internship (3)

Note. **Students must have teaching experience to complete the internship.

Summary

This research was designed to determine the extent to which one university-based principal preparation program is aligned with selected state and national standards and if graduates perceive the program as meeting their needs. In this chapter, literature relevant to the topic of interest was reviewed. A brief history of the principalship and the development of principal preparation programs were presented. Regional and national influences on programs were also discussed. The five sets of standards which form the conceptual framework for this study were introduced and discussed, and the curriculum of the University of Central Florida's Master of Education in Educational Leadership Program, the focus of this study, was detailed. Chapter 3 contains the methodology which was used to conduct the study.

CHAPTER 3 METHODOLOGY

Introduction

This chapter provides a description of the methods and procedures used to conduct the study. It includes a restatement of the purpose of the study and a description of the setting in which the research was conducted. Also included is a detailed explanation of the research design and rationale for its use. The instrumentation used to conduct this mixed methods research study is detailed, and data collection and analysis procedures are discussed.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to determine the efficacy of the Master of Education in Educational Leadership Program at the University of Central Florida. The study was conducted to ensure that course content in the program is aligned with respected standards in the field and to identify any areas of weakness of students in completing the Florida Educational Leadership examination. Additionally, perceptions of students enrolled in the program were reviewed to determine the extent to which they believe the program has been effective in meeting their needs.

Research Setting

This research was conducted at the University of Central Florida (UCF) in Orlando, Florida. UCF began offering classes in 1968 and currently serves over 60,000 students in 13 different colleges. UCF offers courses at its' main campus and campuses

located in Cocoa, Daytona Beach, Downtown Orlando, South Orlando, Lake Sumter Community College, Leesburg, Valencia West, and Seminole State College. UCF is classified as a Research University with very high research activity (RU/VH) (University of Central Florida, 2012). The proposed research was conducted to investigate one degree offered by UCF's College of Education, the Master of Education (M. Ed.) in Educational Leadership.

Research Design

This study was a mixed methods research study and involved the collection of both quantitative and qualitative research to answer the research questions. Using both types of research are complementary and, according to Boodhoo and Purmessur (2009), should be equally emphasized.

Qualitative methods were used in this research; specifically content analyses were used to examine the extent to which the program is aligned with five sets of standards so as to determine any gaps that may exist. The standards with which the program is aligned are those of (a) the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE/Educational Leadership Constituent Council (ELCC), (b) the Interstate School Leader Licensure Consortium (ISLLC), (c) the Florida Educator Accomplished Practices (FEAPs), (d) the Florida Principal Leadership Standards (FPLS), and (e) the Florida Educational Leadership Examination (FELE).

Quantitative research methods were required to analyze data from two archival sources: (a) the Florida Educational Leadership Examination (FELE) results for Master

of Education in Educational Leadership graduates from 2009-2011 and (b) results of the Educational Leadership Exit Survey completed by program graduates between August of 2007 and May of 2012.

Sources of Data

Alignment of Course Objectives with Standards

For this study, the researcher examined all of the course objectives for all of the 17 courses offered in the Master of Education in Educational Leadership Program at the University of Central Florida. The objectives, as stated in instructor-created course syllabi, were matched with the following five sets of accepted standards in the field of educational leadership to determine the extent to which the objectives were aligned with each set of standards: (a) the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE/Educational Leadership Constituent Council (ELCC), (b) the Interstate School Leader Licensure Consortium (ISLLC), (c) the Florida Educator Accomplished Practices (FEAPs), (d) the Florida Principal Leadership Standards (FPLS), and (e) the Florida Educational Leadership Examination (FELE). These data were organized in tabular form (Appendix G) so as to permit a visual comparison of the alignment. The results were further analyzed to determine if voids exist in course offerings. Finally, interviews with program faculty were held to determine if course content met standards that were not specifically addressed through stated objectives.

Master of Education in Educational Leadership Exit Survey

In fall of 2007, a group of UCF graduate students enrolled in EDA 6123, Educational Supervisory Practices, collaborated in developing the Master of Education in Educational Leadership Exit Survey (Appendix H) under the guidance of Dr. Barbara Murray, a UCF professor. This survey was designed to determine graduates' views of the program and their preparation for the job of school leader. In designing the survey, students reviewed surveys from comparable programs at eight colleges and universities, i.e., Auburn University, Fitchburg State College, Tarleton State College, the University of Florida, the University of Nevada-Reno, the University of North Carolina, the University of Utah, and the University of Wisconsin. After this review, the students created a survey which was pilot tested online with current UCF graduate students. This instrument that was pilot tested consisted of 19 items that specifically addressed the goals and objectives of the program. Once the pilot test was complete, the instrument's designers realized that they needed to add two questions to elicit additional information. The survey was modified as needed and converted to a paper-based survey for inclusion in the UCF Guide to the Administrative Internship. In its final form, the 21-item survey addressed aspects of the program including appropriateness of course content, faculty advisement, classroom climate, textbooks, preparation for comprehensive examinations and the Florida Educational Leadership Examination (FELE). Respondents were asked to rate their level of agreement with 21 statements using a five-point Likert-type scale where 1 = Strongly Disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Agree, 4 = Strongly Agree, and 5 = Not Applicable.

This survey was integrated into the UCF Guide to the Administrative Internship (Educational Leadership, 2012)), and students have been encouraged to complete the survey at the conclusion of their internship semesters. It is the results of this Educational Leadership Exit Survey completed by program graduates between August of 2007 and May of 2012 that were analyzed to determine graduates' perceptions about their experiences in the Master of Education in Educational Leadership Program. The instrument has not been subjected to tests of reliability or validity.

Florida Educational Leadership Examination (FELE) Results

In order to assess the extent to which the Educational Leadership Program has prepared its graduates with regard to the Florida Principal Leadership Standards, the results of the FELE examination for the graduates of the University of Central Florida's Educational Leadership for the years 2009-2011 were examined. According to information released by the Florida Department of Education, each university can receive its' students' scores in order to allow the program leaders to review the examination results and to be aware of possible weaknesses in the curriculum.

Officials of Florida public and private colleges of education, community colleges with four-year teaching programs, and educator preparation institutes (EPIs) can obtain disaggregated data by competency area for their respective students. FTCE/FELE test results provide teacher preparation programs with valuable information about their programs' strengths and weaknesses. (Florida Department of Education, 2009, p. 13)

UCF regularly requests and receives the FELE results for its students, and the examination results are maintained in the program area files in the Educational Leadership office after being reviewed by the faculty. For this study, the researcher

accessed all results from 2009-2012 test administrations for each subtest and subtest component (previously displayed in Table 5). The results were reviewed to determine the extent to which student success in passing the test was a reflection of the emphasis placed by the program on the Florida Principal Leadership Standards. Areas of strength and weakness of program graduates were identified through this process.

Archival Documentation

For the development of this dissertation, numerous documents available in UCF's School of Teaching, Learning and Leadership were reviewed to access historical information about the program and background related to the development of the Master of Education in Educational Leadership Degree. Historic data were retrieved from prior educational leadership program reviews, NCATE accreditation self-study materials, dissertations, and programmatic records made available to the researcher. These documents were sources of qualitative and quantitative data which were used in the research. Course syllabi provided the basic information needed to perform the content analysis and served as the primary source of data in the alignment of courses with the five sets of standards.

Analysis of Data

The following discussion is presented to explain how data gathered to answer each of the three research questions were analyzed in this study and to provide detailed information about instrumentation used in the study. Because only archival data were

used in the analysis for this study, it was determined to not be human subject research and was, therefore, not subject to the University of Central Florida's Institutional Review Board review (Appendix I).

The purpose of this study was to complete an examination of the Master of Education in Educational Leadership at the University of Central Florida. In this study, courses in the Master of Education in Educational Leadership were examined and aligned with existing standards in the field of educational leadership: FEAP, FPLS, ELCC, and ISLLC. This alignment was then to determine if there existed any voids in the courses related to these standards. Students' perceptions of the quality of the program were derived from the UCF Masters in Educational Leadership Exit Survey. Finally, data from the FELE examination were studied to determine if these data showed voids in student learning.

Research Question 1

How does course content in the University of Central Florida's Master of Education in Educational Leadership Program align with the following standards and competencies: (a) the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE/Educational Leadership Constituent Council (ELCC)), (b) the Interstate School Leader Licensure Consortium (ISLLC), (c) the Florida Educator Accomplished Practices (FEAP), (d) the Florida Principal Leadership Standards (FPLS), and (e) the Florida Educational Leadership Examination (FELE)?

To answer this research question the researcher aligned each course objective with the related standard. The researcher read each objective, and then read each standard looking for a correlation. A chart was created for master's level courses. This chart aligned objectives with the specific part of each standard that is addressed by that objective. If the researcher found a correlation, the specific standard was noted on the chart. If there was no related standard N/A was noted. This chart was then analyzed to ascertain what, if any, voids occur in the course offerings. Subsequently, based on interviews with the University of Central Florida faculty members, the chart was updated to reflect standards that were met in courses based on additional information provided.

Research Question 2

What are graduates' perceptions of the University of Central Florida's Educational Leadership Program?

To determine graduates' perception, the UCF Educational Leadership Survey was analyzed. This survey was created in 2007 by graduate students participating in a course, EDA 6123, Educational Supervisory Practices I. The students gathered exit surveys from graduate schools across the country. They correlated each survey question with the goals

and objectives of UCF's Educational Leadership Program. They created a pilot survey, which was implemented online. This pilot consisted of 19 items that specifically addressed the goals and objectives of the program. Once the pilot was complete, the students realized that they needed to add two additional questions that were causing a significant gap in the necessary information. These three questions were added to create the current 21-question survey that is being completed by all students completing their M.Ed. in Educational Leadership at the University of Central Florida.

The results of the surveys that were completed during the years of 2007 – 2012 were analyzed for this study. The results of the surveys were input into SPSS and a ranking of means was created. Finally, these results were examined for strengths and weaknesses in the perceptions of graduates of the UCF Educational Leadership Program.

Research Question 3

What, if any, content and knowledge voids occur as based on standards alignment, graduate perceptions, and Florida Educational Leadership Examination (FELE) data?

The results of UCF graduates' performance on the Florida Educational Leadership Examination (FELE) for the years 2008-2011 were examined to identify weaknesses or voids in learning. These results were entered into SPSS and means were created of the composite scores for each of the subsections and then examined. The researcher sought to identify areas of weakness or voids in student learning in the Master of Education Program at the University of Central Florida.

Table 7

Research Questions, Sources of Data, and Data Analysis

Research Question	Sources of Data	Data Analysis
1. How does course content align across FEAPs, FPLS, NCATE, ELCC and ISLLC?	Syllabi for each of the 17 courses, FEAPs standards, FPLS standards, ELCC standards, and ISLLC standards, and faculty interviews	Descriptive Narrative
2. What are graduates perceptions of the University of Central Florida's Educational Leadership Program?	Exit Surveys	Frequencies and percentages (SPSS) Descriptive Narrative
3. What content and knowledge voids exist, if any, based on the analysis of Florida Educational Leadership examination results for 2009-2011?	FELE results	Frequencies and percentages (SPSS) Descriptive Narrative

Summary

The methodology and procedures which were used in the study have been presented in this chapter. The process by which the researcher determined the alignment of courses with the FEAPs, FPLS, ELCC, and ISLLC has been described. The process by which the researcher identified voids in the UCF Educational Leadership Programs has been summarized. The data collection and analysis processes have been delineated and related to the research questions which guided the study. Chapters 4 and 5 contain the analysis of the data and a summary of the findings of the study.

CHAPTER 4 ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to determine the efficacy of the Master of Education in Educational Leadership Program at the University of Central Florida. To make this determination, course content in the program was analyzed to determine the extent to which it was aligned with respected standards in the field. Additionally, the study sought to identify any weaknesses of students in completing the Florida Educational Leadership Examination. Finally, perceptions of students completing the program were reviewed to determine the extent to which they believed the program was effective in meeting their needs.

This chapter contains a summary of the analysis of data for the three research questions that were used to guide the study. Because of the complexity of the five sets of standards and competencies, and the fact that, for the most part course content was determined to be aligned with the standards and competencies, reporting in this chapter has been focused on course content that was not aligned. Tables and accompanying narratives have been used to present the results of the analysis.

Data Analysis for Research Question 1

How does course content in the University of Central Florida's Master of Education in Educational Leadership Program align with the following standards and competencies: (a) the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE/Educational Leadership Constituent Council (ELCC)), (b) the Interstate School Leader Licensure Consortium (ISLLC), (c) the Florida Educator Accomplished Practices (FEAPs), (d) the Florida Principal Leadership Standards (FPLS), and (e) the Florida Educational Leadership Examination (FELE)?

In order to determine whether course content was aligned with each of the standards, the researcher created a template that permitted the analysis of data related to the five sets of standards. This template was used to analyze course syllabi for all of the courses offered in the Master of Education in Educational Leadership Program. For the purposes of this study, syllabi that were analyzed were from Spring 2012 (Appendix G).

The objectives for each course were analyzed for key words and concepts. These concepts were then matched across the standards, and matching key words and concepts were noted. Course objectives within a particular course that matched the same standards were noted as "Same as No. x". Other course objectives that did not match any standards were noted as "None." In addition, face-to-face interviews were conducted with faculty to ensure accurate analysis of course content when syllabi objectives were thought to be incomplete.

Florida Educator Accomplished Practices (FEAPs)

The Florida Educator Accomplished Practices (FEAPs) had the highest number of standard indicators with no matching objectives. The FEAPs were comprised of 36

individual indicators, 12 of which matched none of the course objectives in the Master of Education in Educational Leadership Program. Table 8 displays the standard numbers and the sub-standard indicators for the FEAP that were not aligned with program course content. A subsequent interview with UCF professors regarding these gaps in FEAP showed that while the FEAP standards were not specifically addressed, students were expected to apply knowledge of the standards in the course EDA 6061. Additionally, in courses EDS 6123 and EDS 6130, students were expected to apply knowledge of these standards in their evaluation of teachers.

Table 8

Florida Educator Accomplished Practices (FEAPs) Not Aligned With Course Content

Standard #	Sub-Standard Indicator
1b	Sequences lessons and concepts to ensure coherence and required prior knowledge.
1d	Selects appropriate formative assessments to monitor learning.
1f	Develops learning experiences that require students to demonstrate a variety of applicable skills and competencies.
2c	Conveys high expectations to all students.
2f	Maintains a climate of openness, inquiry, fairness and support.
3a	Deliver engaging and challenging lessons.
3d	Modify instruction to respond to preconceptions or misconceptions.
3e	Relate and integrate the subject matter with other disciplines and life experiences.
3i	Utilize student feedback to monitor instructional needs and to adjust instruction.
4c	Uses a variety of assessment tools to monitor student progress, achievement and learning gains.
4d	Modifies assessments and testing conditions to accommodate learning styles and varying levels of knowledge.
5a	Designs purposeful professional goals to strengthen the effectiveness of instruction based on students' needs.

Florida Educational Leadership Examination (FELE) Competencies

The FELE competencies and skills are separated into three categories: (a) instructional leadership, (b) operational leadership, and (c) school leadership. The instructional leadership category was comprised of 48 indicators, five of which did not match any objective across the courses in the Master of Education in Educational

Leadership Program. Operational leadership contained 29 indicators, eight of which were non-matching. The school leadership category was comprised of 13 indicators, six of which did not match any objectives across all analyzed course content. Table 9 displays the competencies by number and the leadership competency descriptors for each of the three categories that were not found to be aligned with course content in the Master of Education in Educational Leadership Program.

The interviews held with faculty to address the following gaps that were developed based on syllabi objectives showed that all of the objectives were met in the completion of student course work. Specifically students worked extensively with data sets for the completion of EDS 6123 and EDS 6130. The application and use of these data sets meant that these identified gaps are actually met through the completion of course work.

Table 9

Florida Educational Leadership Examination Competencies and Skills Not Aligned With Course Content

Competency	Leadership Competency Descriptor
Instructional	
1.1	Given a scenario, assess the curriculum and school-wide professional development needs of an instructional program.
16.1	Given a scenario, identify the appropriate type of formal assessment instrument (e.g. norm referenced, criterion referenced) to determine student strengths and needs.
16.2	Given a scenario, identify the appropriate informal assessment instrument (e.g. observations, checklist, inventories, interviews) to determine student strengths and needs.
17.1	Given a data set of reading test results for ESE or ESOL students, identify diagnostic tools appropriate for assessing student learning needs.
17.2	Given a data set of reading test results for ESE or ESOL students, identify appropriate instructional strategies to improve student performances in reading.
Operational	
2.2	Given a scenario, select computer hardware and software appropriate to school operations.
2.4	Given a scenario, select web-based communication applications.
2.5	Given a scenario, select presentation software applications.
8.1	Given school or classroom data, analyze teacher performance over time.
11.2	Given a scenario, identify the statutory powers and duties of the Florida Board of Education, Commissioner of Education, local school boards, superintendents, and principals.
School	
2.1	Select strategies to promote community cooperation and partnerships.
3.1	Given a situation, identify reporting procedures of the Florida Department of Law Enforcement’s Missing Children Program.
9.1	Given a scenario including data, analyze, interpret, and evaluate data for a specific target audience.

Florida Principal Leadership Standards (FPLS)

The next set of standards that was analyzed was the Florida Principal Leadership Standards which are required to be met by all principals in Florida. Of the 50 standards, only two could not be aligned with a course objective in the Master of Education in Educational Leadership Program. These standards are displayed in Table 10.

An interview was completed with the professor who oversees the internship course that is a required component of the master's program. This interview determined that students were required to show how they applied each FPLS during the completion of their internship. This requirement means that, though there appeared to be two standards not met, they actually are met through the course of the internship (Appendix E).

Table 10

Florida Principal Leadership Standards (FPLS) Not Aligned with Course Content

Standard #	Standard
5b	Recognizes and uses diversity as an asset in the development and implementation of procedures and practices that motivate all students and improve student learning.
10f	Demonstrates explicit improvement in specific performance areas based on previous evaluations and formative feedback.

Interstate School Leader Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) Standards

The ISLLC standards are comprised of six broad standards designed to serve as guides for educational leadership programs. In the analysis, all of the standards were found to match at least one course objective (Appendix C).

National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education

The final standards that were assessed for alignment were those of the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE/Educational Leadership Constituent Council (ELCC). The ELCC standards have been used by NCATE in determining the accreditation of colleges and university schools of education. There are seven general ELCC standards separated into 28 more specific sub-standards. It was these sub-standards that were used in the matching process, and all were found to match at least one course objective (Appendix B).

Research Question 2

What are graduates' perceptions of the University of Central Florida's Master of Education in Educational Leadership Program?

Graduates' perceptions of the University of Central Florida's Master of Education in Educational Leadership Program at the University of Central Florida were determined based on data gathered from a 21-item survey designed in 2007 by graduate students enrolled in the program. Beginning in 2008, the survey was included in an Internship Guide used by all students completing their administrative internships. Students have been requested, but not required, to anonymously complete the survey at the conclusion

of the internship. As a result, the number of completed surveys each semester has been irregular. As shown in Table 11, the total number of students completing the internship course and the number of students returning the survey varied greatly between 2008 and 2011.

Table 11

EDA 6946 Internship Total Enrollments and Surveys Returned

Semester/Year	Students Enrolled in EDA 6946	Number of Surveys Returned
Spring/2008	14	12
Summer/2008	29	29
Fall/2008	7	4
Spring/2009	16	13
Summer/2009	30	26
Fall/2009	14	0
Spring/2010	11	4
Summer/2010	27	5
Fall/2010	10	6
Spring/2011	4	3
Summer/2011	22	3
Fall/2011	4	2

Data analyzed for this study were gathered from the 91 surveys completed voluntarily from 2008 to 2012 by program graduates. Respondents were asked to indicate their agreement using a Likert-type scale ranging from 1 to 5 where 1 = Strongly Disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Agree, 4 = Strongly Agree, and 5 = Not Applicable. Table 12 displays the results of the analysis of data for responses to the 21 items on the survey. The results of the survey showed overwhelming agreement of respondents on all survey items. The mean for all of the survey questions ranged from a low mean score of 3.29 as to required textbooks being used on a regular basis (item 19) to a high mean score of 4.01 as to the adequacy of preparation for comprehensive examinations (item 15).

Table 12

Perceptions of Program Graduates: Analysis of Survey Data

Survey Items	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Course content drawn from current best practices.	91	3.86	.382	.040
Course content drawn from research and literature.	91	3.84	.454	.048
I received frequent feedback from instructors.	91	3.74	.554	.058
Faculty advisors were available.	91	3.87	.476	.050
Ed Leadership faculty set high expectations.	91	3.89	.407	.043
Information provided by my advisor was accurate and helpful.	90	3.89	.484	.051
Courses were academically challenging.	91	3.68	.612	.064
Faculty advisors kept regular office hours.	91	3.84	.543	.057
Number of students in classes was appropriate.	91	3.92	.453	.047
Student discussion and interactions was encouraged.	91	4.00	.394	.041
Administrative internship was a valuable learning experience.	87	3.91	.497	.053
Instructors expected students to be prepared for presentations and discussions.	87	3.98	.340	.036
Intellectual climate was stimulating.	87	3.82	.471	.050
Educational Leadership department was supportive.	87	3.85	.445	.048
Educational Leadership department adequately prepared students for Comprehensive Exam.	87	4.01	.539	.058
Educational Leadership Department adequately prepared students for the FELE.	86	3.81	.623	.067
Academic program prepared me for my professional career goals.	86	3.88	.389	.042
Courses in my major were offered frequently enough for timely completion of the program.	86	3.62	.672	.072
Textbooks required for the courses were used on a regular basis.	86	3.29	.795	.086
Student interactions and discussions added to the quality of the courses.	86	3.93	.455	.049
Online electronic databases were useful in completing the program requirements.	86	3.60	.724	.078

Research Question 3

What, if any, content and knowledge voids exist based on the analysis of Florida Educational Leadership Examination (FELE) results for 2009-2011?

This question's main focus was on the Florida Educational Leadership Examination (FELE) data which was accessed in UCF's School of Teaching, Learning, and Leadership. The Florida Department of Education (FLDOE) releases these data to schools of education for each test that is taken by students who identify their institutions at the time they are taking the examination. The FLDOE no longer releases student level data, so there was no way for the researcher to separate the actual students from the general data (students who may have identified with UCF but were not actually program graduates). The actual data released are percentages of students passing for each of the competencies and skills measured on the examination. At the time of the present study, passing scores for Subtest 1, Instructional Leadership were set at 75%. For Subtest 2, Operational Leadership, passing scores were set at 74%. Examinee scores for Subtest 3, School Leadership, were a combination of the multiple-choice score and the written performance assessment score. The written performance assessment score was weighted 30% and the multiple-choice score was weighted 70% when determining the combined score. In order to pass Subtest 3 a Scale Score of 200 must be obtained.

The overall passing rates of UCF students in the Educational Leadership Program are very high. Based on results released by the Florida Department of Education and displayed in the table below, UCF students had a 100% pass rate for the years 2009 – 2012 for Subtest 1. The Subtest 2 passing rate was 98.46% in which one student did not

pass the March, 2012 test. The Subtest 3 passing rate was 96.08%, in which one student did not pass in each of the April, 2011, July, 2011, and October, 2012 administrations of the FELE. These results are displayed in Table 13.

Table 13

UCF Pass Rates for Florida Educational Leadership Examination Administrations: April 2009-October 2012

Dates	Percentages		
	Subtest 1	Subtest 2	Subtest 3
2009			
April	100.00	100.00	100.00
October	100.00	100.00	100.00
2010			
April	100.00	100.00	100.00
July	100.00	100.00	100.00
2011			
April	100.00	100.00	89.00
July	100.00	100.00	80.00
November	100.00	100.00	100.00
December	100.00	100.00	100.00
February	100.00	100.00	100.00
2012			
March	100.00	80.00	100.00
June	100.00	100.00	100.00
July	100.00	100.00	100.00
October	100.00	100.00	80.00
Average	100.00	98.46	96.08

For the purposes of this research, the released scores from 2009 through 2012 for UCF students and all examinees in Florida were entered into SPSS, and means were obtained and compared. This permitted further examination of the strongest and weakest areas of UCF program completers for the FELE competencies and skills in the 10 areas

comprised of three major subtests of the examination: (a) instructional leadership, (b) operational leadership, and (c) school leadership. Tables 14 through 21 displays the UCF percentage means for each of the competencies displayed from highest to lowest, the comparative state percentage means, and the difference in the two.

Instructional Leadership Subtest

The Instructional Leadership subtest tests graduates in the following three categories: Instructional Leadership, Managing the Learning Environment, and Learning, Accountability, and Assessment. Tables 14, 15, and 16 show the competencies for each of these areas; the UCF percentage means, the state percentage means for all test takers on examinations from 2009-2012, and the difference in the two means for each competency.

In the first subsection of this subtest, Instructional Leadership, the competency with the highest percentage of UCF students passing was Competency 4, knowledge of instructional leadership standard as related to instructional design, teaching, and learning (M = 93.92%). Second highest was Competency 5, knowledge of instructional leadership standard as related to instructional programs for students with special needs (M = 87.08%). As shown in Table 14, both of these competencies were related to instructional design and programs and revealed strength in this area.

The competencies in this subsection with the lowest percentage of UCF students passing were Competencies 3 (M = 78.67%) and 6 (M = 80.92%). Competency 3, knowledge of instructional leadership standard as related to school culture, was the

lowest competency for this area but was still 9% higher than the state mean. Though Competency 6, knowledge of instructional leadership standard as related to federal and State law in education and schooling, was low compared to the other UCF competency averages, it was 2.25% higher than the State mean.

Table 14

Florida Educational Leadership Examination Subtest 1: Instructional Leadership (Instructional Leadership)

Competency	No.	Percentage UCF	Means State	Percentage Difference
Knowledge of instructional leadership standard as related to instructional design, teaching, and learning	4	93.92	91.17	+2.75
Knowledge of instructional leadership standard as related to instructional programs for students with special needs	5	87.58	86.00	+1.58
Knowledge of instructional leadership standard as related to curriculum development and continuous school improvement process	1	86.08	83.33	+2.75
Knowledge of instructional leadership standard as related to research-based best practices	2	84.83	79.92	+4.91
Knowledge of instructional leadership standard as related to federal and State law in education and schooling	6	80.92	78.67	+2.25
Knowledge of instructional leadership standard as related to school culture	3	78.67	69.67	+9.00

In the second area of Subtest 1, Managing the Learning Environment, competencies with the highest percentages of UCF students passing were Competencies 8 and 12. Details for these competencies are displayed in Table 15. Competency 8, knowledge of managing the learning environment standard as related to funding of Florida schools had a mean of 88.42%; and Competency 12, knowledge of managing the learning environment standard as related to student and parental rights, had a similar mean of 88.17%. These two competencies were also higher, on average, for UCF students than for other students statewide. The lowest percentage for this area was Competency 13, knowledge of managing the learning environment standard as related to federal law for education and schooling. This competency had a percentage mean of 62.17 which was 12.66 points lower than the state mean of 74.83.

Table 15

*Florida Educational Leadership Examination Subtest 1: Instructional Leadership
(Managing the Learning Environment)*

Competency	No.	Percentage UCF	Means State	Percentage Difference
Knowledge of managing the learning environment standard as related to funding of Florida schools	8	88.42	80.52	+7.90
Knowledge of managing the learning environment standard as related to student and parental rights	12	88.17	80.67	+7.50
Knowledge of managing the learning environment standard as related to tort and contract liability in the operation of Florida public schools	7	85.08	80.08	+5.00
Knowledge of managing the learning environment standard as related to facilities management	10	84.42	78.83	+5.59
Knowledge of managing the learning environment standard as related to financial accounting and auditing	9	83.5	79.08	+4.42
Knowledge of managing the learning environment standard as related to student services	11	80.08	77.5	+3.30
Knowledge of managing the learning environment standard as related to federal law for education and schooling	13	62.17	74.83	-12.66

The third area of Subtest 1, Learning, Accountability, and Assessment, is displayed in Table 16. The highest percentage mean of students having passed competencies for this area was for Competency 16, knowledge of learning,

accountability, and assessment standard as related to assessment instruments and their applications, with a UCF percentage mean of 93.17 which was 8.17 percentage points higher than the state average. The lowest percentage mean of students having met a competency in this area was for Competency 17, knowledge of learning, accountability, and assessment standard as related to diagnostic tools to assess, identify, and apply instructional improvement. The percentage means for UCF and all state students were identical (M = 58.08%) which was the lowest percentage mean for UCF students for the entire FELE examination.

Table 16

Florida Educational Leadership Examination Subtest 1: Instructional Leadership (Learning, Accountability, and Assessment)

Competency	No.	Percentage Means		Percentage Difference
		UCF	State	
Knowledge of learning, accountability, and assessment standard as related to assessment instruments and their applications	16	93.17	85.00	+8.17
Knowledge of learning, accountability, and assessment standard as related to measurement of effective student performance	15	81.00	77.17	+3.83
Knowledge of learning, accountability, and assessment standard as related to State law for education and schooling	14	75.5	74.83	+.67
Knowledge of learning, accountability, and assessment standard as related to diagnostic tools to assess, identify, and apply instructional improvement	17	58.08	58.08	-

Operational Leadership Subtest

The second subtest, Operational Leadership, contained 29 competencies and skills in four areas: (a) Technology, (b) Human Resources Development, (c) Ethical Leadership, and (d) Decision-Making Strategies. Tables 17-20 show the competencies for each of these areas; the UCF percentage means, the state percentage means for all test takers on examinations from 2009-2012, and the difference in the two means for each competency.

The first area, Technology, contained only two competencies: Competency 2, knowledge of technology standard related to school operations (M = 82.33%) and Competency 1, knowledge of technology standard in the use of technology for teaching and learning (M = 81.00%). As shown in Table 17, both of the UCF percentage means exceeded the state means, indicating that UCF student performance generally exceeded that of students in other preparatory institutions in the state.

Table 17

Florida Educational Leadership Examination Subtest 2: Operational Leadership (Technology)

Competency	No.	Percentage Means		Percentage Difference
		UCF	State	
Knowledge of technology standard related to school operations	2	82.33	81.42	+.91
Knowledge of technology standard in the use of technology for teaching and learning	1	81.00	78.57	+2.43

The second area of Subtest 2 was Human Resources Development which consisted of seven competencies as shown in Table 18. UCF students garnered the highest percentage mean in Competency 8, knowledge of human resource development standard as related to data analysis (92.00%). The lowest percentage mean for UCF students in this area was shown to be 70.75% for Competency 5, knowledge of human resource development standard as related to managing personnel records. This was .92% lower than the state percentage mean of 71.67%. UCF students, however, had a substantially higher percentage pass rate ($M = 86.42\%$) than did all state students ($M = 74.50\%$) for Competency 6, knowledge of human resource development standard as related to processes and procedures for discipline, dismissal, and nonrenewal of school employees. UCF students' percentage mean exceeded that of the state students by 11.92%.

Table 18

*Florida Educational Leadership Examination Subtest 2: Operational Leadership
(Human Resource Development)*

Competency	No.	Percentage UCF	Means State	Percentage Difference
Knowledge of human resource development standard as related to data analysis	8	92.00	90.75	+1.25
Knowledge of human resource development standard as related to processes and procedures for discipline, dismissal, and nonrenewal of school employees	6	86.42	74.50	+11.92
Knowledge of human resource development standard as related to performance assessment procedures	4	85.08	80.58	+4.5
Knowledge of human resource development standard as related to recruitment, selection, induction, and retention of staff	3	84.58	79.67	+4.91
Knowledge of human resource development standard as related to collective bargaining agreements	7	83.33	77.75	+5.58
Knowledge of human resource development standard as related to state law for education and schooling	9	74.00	70.75	+3.25
Knowledge of human resource development standard as related to managing personnel records	5	70.75	71.67	-.92

The third area of Subtest 2 was Ethical Leadership, which like Technology, had only two competencies. Competency 10, knowledge of ethical leadership standard as related to ethical conduct, had a percentage mean of 89.25. Competency 11, knowledge

of ethical leadership standard as related to federal and State law for education and schooling, had a percentage mean of 86.58. As shown in Table 19, the UCF percentage means for both of these competencies exceeded the state percentage means by 2.50 and 2.25 respectively.

Table 19

Florida Educational Leadership Examination Subtest 2: Operational Leadership (Ethical Leadership)

Competency	No.	Percentage UCF	Percentage State	Percentage Difference
Knowledge of ethical leadership standard as related to ethical conduct	10	89.25	87.00	+2.25
Knowledge of ethical leadership standard as related to federal and state law for education and schooling	11	86.58	84.08	+2.50

The fourth and final area of Subtest 2 was Decision-Making Strategies which consisted of three competencies. As shown in Table 20, the competency with the highest UCF student percentage mean was Competency 13, knowledge of decision-making strategies standard as related to change (M = 84.75%), exceeding the state percentage mean by 9.83%. This was followed closely by Competency 14, knowledge of decision-making strategies standard as related to data analysis (M = 83.75%), exceeding the state percentage mean by 7.17%. The lowest UCF percentage mean was Competency 12, knowledge of decision-making strategies standard as related to federal and/or State law

for education and schooling (M = 78.33%), exceeding the state percentage mean by 1.50%.

Table 20

Florida Educational Leadership Examination Subtest 2: Operational Leadership (Decision-Making Strategies)

Competency	No.	Percentage UCF	Means State	Percentage Difference
Knowledge of decision-making strategies standard as related to change	13	84.75	74.92	+9.83
Knowledge of decision-making strategies standard as related to data analysis	14	83.75	76.58	+7.17
Knowledge of decision-making strategies standard as related to federal and/or state law for education and schooling	12	78.33	76.83	+1.50

Subtest 3, School Leadership, had four areas and included a written assessment. Scores on the assessment were not in percentages. On a 10-point scale, UCF students' mean score was 7.98, slightly higher than the state mean of 7.74. Examinee scores for Subtest 3, School Leadership, represent a combination of the multiple-choice score and the written performance assessment score. The written performance assessment score is weighted at 30% and the multiple-choice score is weighted at 70% when determining the combined score. The scores for UCF students and all state students for the competencies in the remaining three areas in Subtest 3 Community and Stakeholder Partnerships, Diversity, and Vision are displayed in Table 21.

Community and Stakeholder Partnerships include five competencies. The competency for which UCF students generated the highest mean was Competency 3, knowledge of community and stakeholder partnerships standard as related to state law for education and schooling, with a percentage mean of 89.83, which was higher than the state percentage mean of 85.00. The competency with the lowest mean for UCF students was Competency 5, knowledge of community and stakeholder partnerships standard as related to student and parental rights and responsibilities (M= 72.75%) which was lower than the state mean of 78.17%.

Diversity was the second area of Subtest 3 and had only one competency: Competency 6, knowledge of diversity standard as related to federal and State law for education and schooling and organizational communication. The UCF student mean percentage for this competency (M = 87.75%) exceeded that of all state students (82.00%).

The third area of Subtest 3, Vision, contained two competencies, the highest of which for UCF students was Competency 7, knowledge of vision standard that works to relate State standards, the needs of students, the community, and the goals of the school. UCF students had a mean percentage of 85.92%, exceeding that of state students (82.17%). For the second competency, Competency 8, Knowledge of vision standard as related to data analysis, UCF students had a percentage mean (82.62%) lower than the average for all state students (86.08). with a mean of 82.62 which was lower than the state average of 86.08.

Table 21

Florida Educational Leadership Examination Subtest 3: School Leadership

Competency	No.	Percentage UCF	Means State	Percentage Difference
Community and Stakeholder Partnerships				
Knowledge of community and stakeholder partnerships standard as related to state law for education and schooling	3	89.83	85.00	+4.83
Knowledge of community and stakeholder partnerships standard as related to assessment instruments and their applications	2	83.75	80.92	+2.83
Knowledge of community and stakeholder partnerships standard as related to student services	4	79.17	78.17	+1.00
Knowledge of community and stakeholder partnerships standard as related to community relations	1	73.42	68.25	+5.17
Knowledge of community and stakeholder partnerships standard as related to student and parental rights and responsibilities	5	72.75	78.17	-5.42
Diversity				
Knowledge of diversity standard as related to federal and State law for education and schooling and organizational communication	6	87.75	82.00	+5.75
Vision				
Knowledge of vision standard that works to relate State standards, the needs of students, the community, and the goals of the school	7	85.92	82.17	+3.75

Summary

The data from the alignment of courses in the University of Central Florida's Educational Leadership Program with the Florida Educator Accomplished Practices (FEAPs), Florida Educational Leadership Examination (FELE), Florida Principal Leadership Standards (FPLS), National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE)/Educational Leadership Constituent Council (ELCC), and Interstate School Leader Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) have been presented in this chapter. In addition, the results of the Perceptions of Program Graduates Survey from 2007-2011 and the Florida Educational Leadership Examination were presented. Tables used to display the data were supported with accompanying narratives. This analysis was presented to identify weaknesses and voids that may exist in the program. The results are summarized and discussed in Chapter 5

CHAPTER 5 SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction

This chapter is organized into four sections. The first section reviews the statement of the problem and the methodology which includes population, data collection, and the data analysis procedures used for this study. The second section provides a summary and discussion of the major findings related to each of the three research questions. The third section states the implications and recommendations for practice. The last section contains the recommendations for further research.

Statement of the Problem

Since the adoption of revised standards and competencies between 2002 and 2005, the Master of Education in Educational Leadership Program at the University of Central Florida had not been formally reviewed to determine the alignment of courses in the program with the standards and competencies put forth by various state agencies and national professional entities concerned with program quality. At the time of the study, five sets of standards and competencies guided the program, i.e., Florida Educator Accomplished Practices (FEAPs), Florida Educational Leadership Examination Competencies (FELE), Florida Principal Leadership Standards (FPLS), Educational Leadership Constituents Council (ELCC), or Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC). It was important that this review be completed in order to identify

any voids in the program and to ensure that program graduates were well-prepared for their positions as school leaders.

Methodology

Population and Sample

This study was focused on graduates of the Master of Education in Educational Leadership Program. To obtain the perceptions of program graduates, the population for this study consisted of graduates of the Master of Education in Educational Leadership Program at the University of Central Florida between summer 2007 and fall 2011. The sample was a convenience sample of those program graduates who voluntarily completed surveys at the conclusion of their administrative internships, immediately prior to completing their master's degrees for the terms beginning in spring of 2008 and ending in fall of 2011.

Research Design

This study employed a mixed-method design consisting of qualitative and quantitative methods. Data used in this study were archival. In order to determine the alignment of program courses with standards and competencies, a content analysis was performed matching the five sets of standards and competencies to all courses and field experiences in the program. To perform the content analysis, course descriptions and course syllabi were matched with standards and competencies to assess the extent to which they are aligned and if there were any gaps or weaknesses. Finally, an interview

with faculty members was held to determine if there was content that was delivered through course work that was not specifically addressed in the course syllabi.

To determine the perceptions of program graduates, results of the UCF Master's in Educational Leadership Exit Survey were analyzed. Data from 107 surveys administered between spring 2008 and fall 2011 were analyzed. Program perceptions were collected from administrative internship completers enrolled in the Master of Education in Educational Leadership Program at the University of Central Florida.

The Florida Educational Leadership Examination (FELE) data analyses were conducted using 2009-2012 data released by the Florida Department of Education to the University of Central Florida. FELE data were analyzed to determine strengths and weaknesses in each of the three major subtests of the examination, comparing UCF student results with overall state results.

Summary and Discussion of Findings

Presented in this section is a summary and discussion of findings initially presented in Chapter 4. The three research questions which guided the study have been used to organize the ensuing summary of findings and discussion.

Research Question 1

How does course content in the University of Central Florida's Master of Education in Educational Leadership Program align with the following standards and competencies: (a) the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE/Educational Leadership Constituent Council (ELCC)), (b) the Interstate School Leader Licensure Consortium (ISLLC), (c) the Florida Educator Accomplished Practices (FEAPs), (d) the Florida Principal Leadership Standards (FPLS), and (e) the Florida Educational Leadership Examination (FELE).

Overall, the course content in the University of Central Florida's Master of Education in Educational Leadership Program was aligned with the five sets of standards against which they were matched. The courses for the UCF masters' program were aligned with industry standards. The courses varied as to the extent of their alignment. Those courses with a higher number of objectives typically matched more standards than those with fewer objectives.

The courses with the lowest number of matching objectives were EDA 6240 Educational Financial Affairs with two objectives and EDA 6232 Legal Aspects of School Operations with three objectives. EDA 6240 Educational Financial Affairs achieved matches with the following percentages for the various standards: FEAPs, 3%; FELE, 5%; FPLS, 7%; ISLLC, 33%; and ELCC, 11%. EDA 6232 Legal Aspects of School Operations achieved the following percentages for the various standards: FEAPs, 3%; FELE, 23%; FPLS, 28%; ISLLC, 17%; and ELCC, 11%. Conversely, EDA 6502 Organization and Administration of Instructional Programs had 26 objectives and achieved the following percentages of objectives matching with standards: FEAPs, 54%; FELE, 22%; FPLS, 67%; ISLLC, 100%; and ELCC, 46%. While this is an interesting piece of data, in reality no one course should teach all standards. The design of a quality

program would ensure that standards are met throughout the entire program, not in any one course.

One important aspect to consider when making these comparisons and looking at these percentages is, in addition to the number of standards matched, the total number of standards. With the exception of ISLLC for which there were only six broad standards, all of the industry standards had sub-standards or competencies that were used to match the objectives. This made it much easier to get a higher percentage of matches for those standards. The standards varied in number, ranging from 28 ELCC standards to 92 FELE competencies. This variance naturally impacted the overall number of matches possible.

Interviews were held to determine whether content of courses met other standards that were not specifically met based on objectives on the course syllabi. These interviews were held with senior professors who had taught in the program over a period of years. Interviewing adjunct professors was avoided.

These interviews showed that the specific Florida standards (FEAP, FELE, and FPLS) were addressed or their use was required by students throughout the program. Students in courses where teacher evaluation was a key component were required to use FEAP standards in their evaluations. FELE standards were determined to have been addressed throughout all course work as courses were designed around the components of the FELE. The FPLS were used throughout the entire program, and students were required to use them specifically during the completion of their internship.

Research Question 2

What are graduates' perceptions of the University of Central Florida's Master of Education in Educational Leadership Program?

The graduate survey designed by students in the program has been included in the UCF Educational Leadership Internship Guide. Though students have been encouraged to complete and return the survey at the conclusion of their internships, it has not been a requirement. Surveys were completed by 107 students (57%) of those completing internships between 2008 and 2012.

This survey contained 21 items that used a five-point Likert Scale ranging from a low of 1 to a high of 4 with 5 = not applicable. The items with the highest means were item 10, Student discussion and interactions were encouraged (mean = 4.0), and item 15, Educational Leadership Department adequately prepared students for Comprehensive Exam (mean = 4.01). The item with the lowest mean was item 19, Textbooks required for the courses were used on a regular basis (mean = 3.29).

Research Question 3

What, if any, content and knowledge voids exist based on the examination of Florida Educational Leadership Examination (FELE) results for 2009-2011?

In this study, results of the Florida Educational Leadership Examination (FELE) were reviewed to identify content and knowledge voids in the University of Central Florida Master of Education in Educational Leadership Program. To accomplish this, UCF scores were reviewed for the three subtests, and percentage means of UCF students' percent correct for those, who took the test between 2009 and 2011, were compared to

the percentage means of students taking the test state-wide. Low percentage correct means and differences between the UCF percentage and the state percentage were used to determine weak areas of the program where content and knowledge voids may exist. UCF students scored, on average, higher than the other students in the state. Of a total of 40 categories, UCF's percentages were higher than the state in 35 categories. The greatest discrepancy was found on Subtest 2, Human Resource Development, Competency 6, knowledge of human resource development standard as related to processes and procedures for discipline, dismissal, and nonrenewal of school employees, where UCF percentages exceeded those of state scores by 11.92%. The one area where the percentages were the same was on Subtest 1, Learning, Accountability, and Assessment, Competency 17, knowledge of learning, accountability, and assessment standard as related to diagnostic tools to assess, identify, and apply instructional improvement.

There were four areas where the UCF average was lower than the state average. The largest discrepancy was on Subtest 1, Managing the Learning Environment, Competency 13, knowledge of managing the learning environment standard as related to federal law for education and schooling where the state average exceeded the UCF average by 12.66%. The second largest discrepancy was identified in Subtest 3, Community and Stakeholder Partnerships, Competency 5: knowledge of community and stakeholder partnerships standard as related to student and parental rights and responsibilities where the state percent correct exceeded that of UCF students by 5.42. A third discrepancy (3.46%) was also identified in Subtest 3, Vision, Competency 8,

knowledge of vision standard as related to data analysis. Finally the last area where UCF students' percent correct was lower than the state average was in Subtest 2, Human Resource and Development, Competency 5, knowledge of human resource development standard as related to managing personnel records. The average for state students exceeded that of UCF students by only .92%.

These results did not show a pattern in the area(s) of weakness in all three subtests. In fact, one of UCF students' strongest and one of the weakest averages were in competencies within Subtest 2, Human Resource and Development. For Competency 6, the UCF student mean percent correct exceeded the state student mean, but the state student mean exceeded the UCF student mean for Competency 5 in the same area. Overall, it was clear that the students in the UCF Educational Leadership Program performed very well on the FELE examination.

Implications and Recommendations for Practice

The implications of the research elicit the following recommendations for practice for the UCF Educational Leadership Program:

Based on the data elicited from the first research question, the variety of courses allow for most standards to be met through the completion of all coursework. The one set of standards that had the highest number of standards that were not met by coursework were the FEAP standards. This can be explained, in part, by the fact that the FEAP are standards which must be met by teachers prior to initial certification, and the assumption is that students preparing to be administrators will already have met this

requirement. Still, demonstration of competency is required by the Florida State Department of Education for all students completing an Educational Leadership Program leading to certification as an administrator. Based on this researcher's interview with Dr. Rosemarye Taylor, UCF students meet the FEAP requirement in the Internship experience required of all students enrolled in the M. Ed. in Educational Leadership Program. Students are required to identify FEAP standards as related to the activities that they plan and complete in their internships.

Also important as a consideration related to the first research question developed while this research was being conducted, the Florida Department of Education passed a new set of FELE Competencies (Appendix A) based on the new FPLS Standards. This will lead to the necessity of rewriting course syllabi to address these new competencies. A recommendation for the faculty of the program is that all syllabi be written in a similar way. This should include both objectives and specific standards that are met. These standards could be either FELE Competencies or FPLS Standards or both. The syllabi, as obtained by this researcher, were written in a variety of ways. Some had no objectives, while some had as many as 26. Others included FELE competencies, but many did not. It would be beneficial for students, faculty, and researchers to have some consistency in this regard.

Recommendations related to Research Question 2, the exit survey, are few. The main reason for this is that the survey in its current form is not very useful for collecting data. First, completing the survey is not a requirement for students completing the internship. This could lead to skewed data with students who are less than satisfied

choosing not to complete a survey. Another issue is related to the Likert Scale and the use of 5 = Not Applicable. Students, if they do not read carefully, may consider 5 to be the highest score, leading to an inaccurate representation of students' perceptions. Based on these observations, it would be beneficial to the program to reconsider both scoring rubric and the administration of the survey. In regard to substance of the program, students did express some dissatisfaction with the use of textbooks in their classes. Faculty might re-examine their choices as to required textbooks to see if they are essential or if there are other texts that might be used more effectively.

The third research question was related to the results of the Florida Educational Leadership Examination (FELE). These results showed that overall the UCF program as having prepared its' students well for the examination. On the three subtests, the weakest test was Subtest 1, Instructional Leadership, with 76.83% of students answering all questions correctly. This subtest includes the weakest area (Learning, Accountability, and Assessment), on average, in the entire examination for both UCF and state students. For Competency 17, Knowledge of learning, accountability, and assessment standard as related to diagnostic tools to assess, identify, and apply instructional improvement. Only 58.08% of UCF and state students passed this competency. It is recommended that this topic be reviewed and given more attention in one or more courses. Based on this competency's having been identified as weak for both state and UCF students, review of associated test items may also be wise. Finally, it is the recommendation of this researcher that faculty consider how vision is best addressed as a part of required coursework. This topic is an integral part of both sets of national standards, and the mean

UCF student FELE scores for vision were lower than those of all state students. Though it was clarified in interviews that this topic is indirectly considered, it was not directly addressed.

Recommendations for Further Research

The analyses of the data identified several additional areas of study that could be considered. Thus, the following recommendations for further research are recommended:

1. Course specific research could be conducted using student perceptions. This could be accomplished through a survey at the end of each course. An open-ended type of survey would be most beneficial for faculty, as it would yield specifics that could then be used. This would help clarify how students feel about a specific course, rather than the entire program.
2. A comparative study could be conducted of students in cohorts and those who are not to determine if cohorts improve student satisfaction and/or FELE scores.
3. This study could be replicated, in part, using revised syllabi and new FELE scores.
4. If student level data could be accessed, it would be beneficial to study students who have completed the program against those who did not.

APPENDIX A
COMPETENCIES AND SKILLS: CERTIFICATION IN EDUCATIONAL
LEADERSHIP IN FLORIDA, FOURTH EDITION, 2012

**COMPETENCIES AND SKILLS
REQUIRED FOR
CERTIFICATION IN
EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP
IN FLORIDA,
Fourth Edition 2012**

Florida Department of Education
<http://www.fldoe.org/asp/fele/default.asp>



Developed, produced, and printed under the authority of the
Florida Department of Education
Pam Stewart, Commissioner

Copyright 2012
State of Florida
Department of State

Authorization for reproduction of this document is hereby granted to persons acting in an official capacity within the Florida K–20 education system, as enumerated in Section 1000.04, Florida Statutes.

Permission is NOT granted for distribution or reproduction outside the State system of public education or for commercial distribution of the copyrighted materials without written authorization from the Department of Education. Questions regarding use of these copyrighted materials are to be addressed to

FELE Administrator
Florida Department of Education
325 West Gaines Street, Suite 414
Tallahassee, Florida 32399-0400

Subtest #1: Leadership for Student Learning

- 1 Knowledge of effective facilitation of positive achievement results aligned with student learning goals and state accountability measures**
 1. Analyze and determine appropriate school learning goals using State Board of Education adopted educational standards and district adopted curriculum.
 2. Identify and analyze areas of greatest need for improvement based on state accountability measures.
 3. Evaluate student learning results based on student performance and growth on assessments.
 4. Identify methods of providing meaningful feedback to improve instructional planning and delivery.

- 2 Knowledge of effective prioritization of student learning through leadership actions that build and support a learning organization focused on student success and continuous improvement**
 1. Identify and select appropriate strategies that assure faculty and staff will work as a learning organization focused on continuous improvement of student learning.
 2. Analyze and determine appropriate strategies that enhance a school's climate and support student engagement in learning.
 3. Evaluate and apply effective strategies that create high expectations for student learning gains.
 4. Identify and discriminate among effective strategies that engage faculty and staff in order to improve academic performance and close achievement gaps among student subgroups.

- 3 Knowledge of effective development and implementation of an instructional framework that aligns school curriculum with state standards, effective instructional strategies, student learning needs, and assessments**
 1. Identify appropriate evaluation and monitoring strategies that assure the Florida Educator Accomplished Practices are implemented through effective instruction.

2. Analyze and assess teaching practices based on observation and monitored outcomes in order to improve a teacher's instructional planning and performance.
3. Evaluate and select rigorous and culturally relevant instructional methods for implementing State Board of Education adopted educational standards and district adopted curricula.
4. Identify effective and appropriate implementation of formative and interim assessments aligned with State Board of Education adopted educational standards and district adopted curricula.

4 Knowledge of effective structuring and monitoring of a school environment that improves learning for all student populations

1. Identify appropriate strategies for maintaining a respectful and inclusive student-centered learning environment that seeks to provide equitable opportunities for all students.
2. Select effective strategies that create a school culture focused on building a foundation for life in a diverse democratic society and global economy.
3. Analyze and select practices that value diversity as an asset in the development and implementation of procedures and practices that motivate all students and improve student learning.
4. Identify effective and recurring monitoring and feedback processes that support continuous student learning growth and school improvement.
5. Identify appropriate and effective professional learning opportunities and strategies that engage faculty in recognizing and understanding diversity and developmental issues in order to close achievement gaps.

Subtest #2: Organizational Development

- 1 Knowledge of effective recruitment and induction practices to develop a high-performing, diverse faculty and staff**
 1. Analyze and assess processes and methods of recruiting and employing a diverse faculty with the instructional proficiencies needed for the school population being served.
 2. Identify and analyze strategies to induct new faculty members into a school's culture.

- 2 Knowledge of effective practices for the development and retention of high-performing, diverse faculty and staff**
 1. Identify and evaluate professional learning that focuses on student performance as it relates to a school's goals and objectives.
 2. Identify appropriate allocations of resources necessary to engage faculty in ongoing, effective individual and collaborative professional learning.
 3. Determine appropriate processes and methods for evaluating, monitoring, and providing timely feedback to faculty regarding the effectiveness of their instruction.
 4. Identify and evaluate instructional effectiveness of faculty utilizing classroom observations and student assessment outcomes.
 5. Determine appropriate strategies for professional learning that prepare faculty to create and deliver rigorous, differentiated, and culturally relevant instruction.
 6. Identify and select appropriate strategies for communicating and providing corrective feedback to faculty in situations where remediation, disciplinary, or personnel actions are applicable.

- 3 Knowledge of effective practices that cultivate, support, and develop leaders within the organization**
 1. Identify appropriate methods of developing potential and emerging leaders.
 2. Identify and evaluate strategies for delegating tasks.
 3. Differentiate among strategies for succession management in key positions.

4. Identify and assess teacher-leadership functions focused on improving instructional effectiveness and student learning.

4 Knowledge of personal and professional behavior consistent with quality practices in education and community leadership

1. Identify appropriate behavior as outlined in the Code of Ethics of the Education Profession in Florida and the Principles of Professional Conduct for the Education Profession in Florida, pursuant to Rules 6B-1.001 and 6B-1.006, F.A.C.
2. Identify examples of resilient behaviors that maintain focus on the school vision and react constructively to barriers.
3. Determine and evaluate appropriate professional learning opportunities that enhance leadership practices and align with school needs.
4. Identify processes that create and support sustainable and collaborative relationships.

Subtest #3: Systems Leadership

- 1 Knowledge of effective decision-making processes that are based on research, best practices, and leadership theory to support the mission, vision, and improvement priorities of schools**
 1. Analyze and prioritize decisions and actions that minimize the impact of negative situations on the quality of student learning and teacher performance.
 2. Analyze and evaluate decisions for effectiveness (e.g., intended and actual outcomes, equity, implementation of follow-up actions, revisions).
 3. Identify effective strategies that empower others through the distribution of leadership roles when appropriate.
 4. Select appropriate steps in a change process that effectively facilitate implementation of new policies or procedures.

- 2 Knowledge of effective organizational theory, research, and management practices related to school operations that maximize a safe and effective learning environment**
 1. Analyze and evaluate strategies for organizing time, tasks, technologies, and projects effectively with clear goals, objectives, and plans.
 2. Identify appropriate roles, responsibilities, and practices that assure effective discipline and promote a safe learning environment.
 3. Identify and evaluate appropriate actions that assure the health, safety, and welfare of all persons on campus.
 4. Assess and analyze effective strategies for managing schedules and delegating responsibilities in order to promote collegial efforts in school improvement and faculty development.

- 3 Knowledge of effective utilization of resources and fiscal management practices that maximize a safe and effective learning environment**
 1. Identify and assess methods of maximizing the use of federal, state, and local fiscal resources (e.g., school budget, grant funding) for instructional priorities.

2. Identify appropriate procedures to manage school fiscal resources (e.g. fundraisers, extracurricular, athletics) and property consistent with state guidelines and accounting practices.
3. Identify the foundational concepts for the formula factors used in computing the Florida Education Finance Program allocations.
4. Identify funding sources available to a school beyond Florida Education Finance Program allocations.

4 Knowledge of school legal practices and applications that assure a safe and effective learning environment

1. Determine whether appropriate educational and/or physical accommodations were made or provided, under state and/or federal guidelines, for students by school and district staff.
2. Identify state and/or federal guidelines and procedures for maintaining a safe learning environment for the well being of all students.
3. Identify legal requirements that ensure compliance with federal and state law as related to the constitutional and statutory rights of students, staff, and parents.

5 Knowledge of effective communication practices that accomplish school and system-wide goals by building and maintaining collaborative relationships with stakeholders

1. Analyze data and communicate, in writing, appropriate information to stakeholders.
2. Analyze data and communicate, in writing, strategies for creating opportunities within a school that engage stakeholders.
3. Analyze data and communicate, in writing, strategies that increase motivation and improve morale while promoting collegial efforts.

APPENDIX B
EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP CONSTITUENT COUNCIL (ELCC/NCATE)
STANDARDS

2011 ELCC Building Level Standards:

Standard 1.0: A building-level education leader applies knowledge that promotes the success of every student by collaboratively facilitating the development, articulation, implementation, and stewardship of a shared school vision of learning through the collection and use of data to identify school goals, assess organizational effectiveness, and implement school plans to achieve school goals; promotion of continual and sustainable school improvement; and evaluation of school progress and revision of school plans supported by school-based stakeholders.

1.1 Candidates understand and can collaboratively develop, articulate, implement, and steward a shared vision of learning for a school.

1.2 Candidates understand and can collect and use data to identify school goals, assess organizational effectiveness, and implement plans to achieve school goals.

1.3 Candidates understand and can promote continual and sustainable school improvement.

1.4 Candidates understand and can evaluate school progress and revise school plans supported by school stakeholders.

Standard 2.0: A building-level education leader applies knowledge that promotes the success of every student by sustaining a school culture and instructional program conducive to student learning through collaboration, trust, and a personalized learning environment with high expectations for students; creating and evaluating a comprehensive, rigorous and coherent curricular and instructional school program; developing and supervising the instructional and leadership capacity of school staff; and promoting the most effective and appropriate technologies to support teaching and learning within a school environment.

2.1 Candidates understand and can sustain a school culture and instructional program conducive to student learning through collaboration, trust, and a personalized learning environment with high expectations for students.

2.2 Candidates understand and can create and evaluate a comprehensive, rigorous, and coherent curricular and instructional school program.

2.3 Candidates understand and can develop and supervise the instructional and leadership capacity of school staff.

2.4 Candidates understand and can promote the most effective and appropriate technologies to support teaching and learning in a school environment.

Standard 3.0: A building-level education leader applies knowledge that promotes the success of every student by ensuring the management of the school organization, operation, and resources through monitoring and evaluating the school management and operational systems; efficiently using human, fiscal, and technological resources in a school environment; promoting and protecting the welfare and safety of school students and staff; developing school capacity for distributed leadership; and ensuring that teacher and organizational time is focused to support high-quality instruction and student learning.

3.1 Candidates understand and can monitor and evaluate school management and operational systems.

3.2 Candidates understand and can efficiently use human, fiscal, and technological resources to manage school operations.

3.3 Candidates understand and can promote school-based policies and procedures that protect the welfare and safety of students and staff within the school.

3.4 Candidates understand and can develop school capacity for distributed leadership.

3.5 Candidates understand and can ensure teacher and organizational time focuses on supporting high-quality school instruction and student learning.

Standard 4.0: A building-level education leader applies knowledge that promotes the success of every student by collaborating with faculty and community members, responding to diverse community interests and needs, and mobilizing community resources on behalf of the school by collecting and analyzing information pertinent to improvement of the school's educational environment; promoting an understanding, appreciation, and use of the diverse cultural, social, and intellectual resources within the school community; building and sustaining positive school relationships with families and caregivers; and cultivating productive school relationships with community partners.

4.1 Candidates understand and can collaborate with faculty and community members by collecting and analyzing information pertinent to the improvement of the school's educational environment.

4.2 Candidates understand and can mobilize community resources by promoting an understanding, appreciation, and use of diverse cultural, social, and intellectual resources within the school community.

4.3 Candidates understand and can respond to community interests and needs by building and sustaining positive school relationships with families and caregivers.

4.4 Candidates understand and can respond to community interests and needs by building and sustaining productive school relationships with community partners.

Standard 5.0: A building-level education leader applies knowledge that promotes the success of every student by acting with integrity, fairness, and in an ethical manner to ensure a school system of accountability for every student’s academic and social success by modeling school principles of self-awareness, reflective practice, transparency, and ethical behavior as related to their roles within the school; safeguarding the values of democracy, equity, and diversity within the school; evaluating the potential moral and legal consequences of decision making in the school; and promoting social justice within the school to ensure that individual student needs inform all aspects of schooling.

5.1 Candidates understand and can act with integrity and fairness to ensure a school system of accountability for every student’s academic and social success.

5.2 Candidates understand and can model principles of self-awareness, reflective practice, transparency, and ethical behavior as related to their roles within the school.

5.3 Candidates understand and can safeguard the values of democracy, equity, and diversity within the school.

5.4 Candidates understand and can evaluate the potential moral and legal consequences of decision making in the school.

5.5 Candidates understand and can promote social justice within the school to ensure that individual student needs inform all aspects of schooling.

Standard 6.0: A building-level education leader applies knowledge that promotes the success of every student by understanding, responding to, and influencing the larger political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context through advocating for school students, families, and caregivers; acting to influence local, district, state, and national decisions affecting student learning in a school environment; and anticipating and assessing emerging trends and initiatives in order to adapt school-based leadership strategies.

6.1 Candidates understand and can advocate for school students, families, and caregivers.

6.2 Candidates understand and can act to influence local, district, state, and national decisions affecting student learning in a school environment.

6.3 Candidates understand and can anticipate and assess emerging trends and initiatives in order to adapt school-based leadership strategies.

Standard 7.0: A building-level education leader applies knowledge that promotes the success of every student through a substantial and sustained educational leadership internship experience that has school-based field experiences and clinical internship practice within a school setting and is monitored by a qualified, on-site mentor

7.1 Substantial Field and Clinical Internship Experience: The program provides significant field experiences and clinical internship practice for candidates within a school environment to synthesize and apply the content knowledge and develop professional skills identified in the other Educational Leadership Building-Level Program Standards through authentic, school-based leadership experiences.

7.2 Sustained Internship Experience: *Candidates are provided a six-month, concentrated (9–12 hours per week) internship that includes field experiences within a school-based environment.*

7.3 Qualified On-Site Mentor: *An on-site school mentor who has demonstrated experience as an educational leader within a school and is selected collaboratively by the intern and program faculty with training by the supervising institution.*

APPENDIX C
INTERSTATE SCHOOL LEADER LICENSURE CONSORTIUM (ISLLC)

ISSLC Standards 2008:

Standard 1

An education leader promotes the success of every student by facilitating the development, articulation, implementation, and stewardship of a vision of learning that is shared and supported by all stakeholders.

Functions:

- A. *Collaboratively develop and implement a shared vision and mission.*
- B. *Collect and use data to identify goals, assess organizational effectiveness, and promote organizational learning.*
- C. *Create and implement plans to achieve goals*
- D. *Promote continuous and sustainable improvement*
- E. *Monitor and Evaluate progress and revise plans*

Standard 2

An education leader promotes the success of every student by advocating, nurturing and sustaining a school culture and instructional program conducive to student learning and staff professional growth.

Functions:

- A. *Nurture and sustain a culture of collaboration, trust, learning, and high expectations*
- B. *Create a comprehensive, rigorous, and coherent curricular program*
- C. *Create a personalized and motivating learning environment for students*
- D. *Supervise instruction*
- E. *Develop assessment and accountability systems to monitor student progress*
- F. *Develop the instructional and leadership capacity of staff*
- G. *Maximize time spent on quality instruction*
- H. *Promote the use of the most effective and appropriate technologies to support teaching and learning*
- I. *Monitor and evaluate the impact of the instructional program*

Standard 3

An educational leader promotes the success of every student by ensuring management of organization, operation, and resources for a safe, efficient, and effective learning environment.

Functions:

- A. Monitor and evaluate the management and operational systems*
- B. Obtain, allocate, align, and efficiently utilize human, fiscal, and technological resources*
- C. Promote and protect the welfare and safety of all students and staff*
- D. Develop the capacity for distributed leadership*
- E. Ensure teacher and organizational time is focused to support quality instruction and student learning*

Standard 4

An education leader promotes the success of every student by collaborating with faculty and community members, responding to diverse community interests and needs, and mobilizing community resources.

Functions:

- A. Collect and analyze data and information pertinent to the educational environment*
- B. Promote understanding, appreciation, and use of the community's diverse cultural, social, and intellectual resources*
- C. Build and sustain positive relationships with families and caregivers*
- D. Build and sustain productive relationships with community partners*

Standard 5

An education leader promotes the success of every student by acting with integrity, fairness, and in an ethical manner.

Functions:

- A. Ensure a system of accountability for every student's academic and social success*
- B. Model principles of self-awareness reflective practice, transparency, and ethical behavior*
- C. Safeguard the values of democracy, equity, and diversity*
- D. Consider and evaluate the potential moral and legal consequences of decision-making*
- E. Promote social justice and ensure that individual student needs inform all aspects of schooling*

Standard 6

An education leader promotes the success of every student by understanding responding to, and influencing the political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context.

Functions:

- A. Advocate for children, families, and caregivers*
- B. Act to influence local, district, state, and national decisions affecting student learning*
- C. Assess, analyze, and anticipate emerging trends and initiatives in order to adapt leadership strategies (ISSLC, 2008 pgs. 14-15)*

APPENDIX D
THE FLORIDA EDUCATOR ACCOMPLISHED PRACTICES (FEAPs)

Florida Educator Accomplished Practices:

1. Instructional Design and Lesson Planning. Applying concepts from human development and learning theories, the effective educator consistently:
 - a) Aligns instruction with state-adopted standards at the appropriate level of rigor;
 - b) Sequences lessons and concepts to ensure coherence and required prior knowledge.
 - c) Designs instruction for students to achieve mastery;
 - d) Selects appropriate formative assessments to monitor learning;
 - e) Uses a variety of data, independently, and in collaboration with colleagues, to evaluate learning outcomes, adjust planning and continuously improve the effectiveness of the lessons; and
 - f) Develops learning experiences that require students to demonstrate a variety of applicable skills and competencies.

2. The Learning Environment. To maintain a student-centered learning environment that is safe, organized, equitable, flexible, inclusive, and collaborative, the effective educator consistently:
 - a) Organizes, allocates, and manages the resources of time, space, and attention;
 - b) Manages individual and class behaviors through a well-planned management system;
 - c) Conveys high expectations to all students;
 - d) Respects students' cultural, linguistic and family background;
 - e) Models clear, acceptable oral and written communication skills;
 - f) Maintains a climate of openness, inquiry, fairness and support;
 - g. Integrates current information and communication technologies;
 - h. Adapts the learning environment to accommodate the differing needs and diversity of students; and
 - i. Utilizes current and emerging assistive technologies that enable students to participate in high-quality communication interactions and achieve their educational goals.

3. Instructional Delivery and Facilitation. The effective educator consistently utilizes a deep and comprehensive knowledge of the subject taught to:
 - a) Deliver engaging and challenging lessons;
 - b) Deepen and enrich students' understanding through content area literacy strategies, verbalization of thought, and application of the subject matter;
 - c) Identify gaps in students' subject matter knowledge;
 - d) Modify instruction to respond to preconceptions or misconceptions;
 - e) Relate and integrate the subject matter with other disciplines and life experiences;
 - f) Employ higher-order questioning techniques;
 - g) Apply varied instructional strategies and resources, including appropriate technology, to provide comprehensible instruction, and to teach for student understanding;
 - h) Differentiate instruction based on an assessment of student learning needs and recognition of individual differences in students;
 - i) Support, encourage, and provide immediate and specific feedback to students to promote student achievement; and
 - j) Utilize student feedback to monitor instructional needs and to adjust instruction.

4. Assessment. The effective educator consistently:

- a) Analyzes and applies data from multiple assessments and measures to diagnose students' learning needs, informs instruction based on those needs, and drives the learning process;
- b) Designs and aligns formative and summative assessments that match learning objectives and lead to mastery;
- c) Uses a variety of assessment tools to monitor student progress, achievement and learning gains;
- d) Modifies assessments and testing conditions to accommodate learning styles and varying levels of knowledge;
- e) Shares the importance and outcomes of student assessment data with the student and the student's parent/caregiver(s); and
- f) Applies technology to organize and integrate assessment information.

5. Continuous Improvement, Responsibility and Ethics.

1. Continuous Professional Improvement. The effective educator consistently:

- a) Designs purposeful professional goals to strengthen the effectiveness of instruction based on students' needs;
- b) Examines and uses data-informed research to improve instruction and student achievement;
- c) Collaborates with the home, school and larger communities to foster communication and to support student learning and continuous improvement;
- d) Engages in targeted professional growth opportunities and reflective practices, both independently and in collaboration with colleagues; and
- e) Implements knowledge and skills learned in professional development in the teaching and learning process.

2. Professional Responsibility and Ethical Conduct. Understanding that educators are held to a high moral standard in a community, the effective educator adheres to the Code of Ethics and the Principles of Professional Conduct of the Education Profession of Florida, pursuant to State Board of Education Rules 6B-1.001 and 6B-1.006, F.A.C, and fulfills the expected obligations to students, the public and the education profession.

Rulemaking Authority 1004.04, 1004.85, 1012.225, 1012.34, 1012.56 FS. Law Implemented 1004.04, 1004.85, 1012.225, 1012.34, 1012.56 FS. History—New 7-2-98; Amended 12-17-10.

APPENDIX E
FLORIDA PRINCIPAL LEADERSHIP STANDARDS (FPLS)

Florida Principal Leadership Standards.

Domain 1: Student Achievement:

Standard 1: Student Learning Results. Effective school leaders achieve results on the school's student learning goals.

- a. The school's learning goals are based on the state's adopted student academic standards and the district's adopted curricula; and
- b. Student learning results are evidenced by the student performance and growth on statewide assessments; district-determined assessments that are implemented by the district under Section 1008.22, F.S.; international assessments; and other indicators of student success adopted by the district and state.

Standard 2: Student Learning as a Priority. Effective school leaders demonstrate that student learning is their top priority through leadership actions that build and support a learning organization focused on student success. The leader:

- a. Enables faculty and staff to work as a system focused on student learning;
- b. Maintains a school climate that supports student engagement in learning;
- c. Generates high expectations for learning growth by all students; and
- d. Engages faculty and staff in efforts to close learning performance gaps among student subgroups within the school.

Domain 2: Instructional Leadership:

Standard 3: Instructional Plan Implementation. Effective school leaders work collaboratively to develop and implement an instructional framework that aligns curriculum with state standards, effective instructional practices, student learning needs and assessments. The leader:

- a. Implements the Florida Educator Accomplished Practices as described in Rule 6A-5.065, F.A.C., through a common language of instruction;
- b. Engages in data analysis for instructional planning and improvement;
- c. Communicates the relationships among academic standards, effective instruction, and student performance;
- d. Implements the district's adopted curricula and state's adopted academic standards in a manner that is rigorous and culturally relevant to the students and school; and
- e. Ensures the appropriate use of high quality formative and interim assessments aligned with the adopted standards and curricula.

Standard 4: Faculty Development. Effective school leaders recruit, retain and develop an effective and diverse faculty and staff. The leader:

- a. Generates a focus on student and professional learning in the school that is clearly linked to the system-wide strategic objectives and the school improvement plan;
- b. Evaluates, monitors, and provides timely feedback to faculty on the effectiveness of instruction;
- c. Employs a faculty with the instructional proficiencies needed for the school population served;
- d. Identifies faculty instructional proficiency needs, including standards-based content, research-based pedagogy, data analysis for instructional planning and improvement, and the use of instructional technology;
- e. Implements professional learning that enables faculty to deliver culturally relevant and differentiated instruction; and
- f. Provides resources and time and engages faculty in effective individual and collaborative professional learning throughout the school year.

Standard 5: Learning Environment. Effective school leaders structure and monitor a school learning environment that improves learning for all of Florida’s diverse student population. The leader:

- a. Maintains a safe, respectful and inclusive student-centered learning environment that is focused on equitable opportunities for learning and building a foundation for a fulfilling life in a democratic society and global economy;
- b. Recognizes and uses diversity as an asset in the development and implementation of procedures and practices that motivate all students and improve student learning;
- c. Promotes school and classroom practices that validate and value similarities and differences among students;
- d. Provides recurring monitoring and feedback on the quality of the learning environment;
- e. Initiates and supports continuous improvement processes focused on the students’ opportunities for success and well-being; and
- f. Engages faculty in recognizing and understanding cultural and developmental issues related to student learning by identifying and addressing strategies to minimize and/or eliminate achievement gaps.

Domain 3: Organizational Leadership:

Standard 6: Decision Making. Effective school leaders employ and monitor a decision-making process that is based on vision, mission and improvement priorities using facts and data. The leader:

- a. Gives priority attention to decisions that impact the quality of student learning and teacher proficiency;
- b. Uses critical thinking and problem solving techniques to define problems and identify solutions;
- c. Evaluates decisions for effectiveness, equity, intended and actual outcome; implements follow-up actions; and revises as needed;
- d. Empowers others and distributes leadership when appropriate; and
- e. Uses effective technology integration to enhance decision making and efficiency throughout the school.

Standard 7: Leadership Development. Effective school leaders actively cultivate, support, and develop other leaders within the organization. The leader:

- a. Identifies and cultivates potential and emerging leaders;
- b. Provides evidence of delegation and trust in subordinate leaders;
- c. Plans for succession management in key positions;
- d. Promotes teacher-leadership functions focused on instructional proficiency and student learning; and
- e. Develops sustainable and supportive relationships between school leaders, parents, community, higher education and business leaders.

Standard 8: School Management. Effective school leaders manage the organization, operations, and facilities in ways that maximize the use of resources to promote a safe, efficient, legal, and effective learning environment. The leader:

- a. Organizes time, tasks and projects effectively with clear objectives and coherent plans;
- b. Establishes appropriate deadlines for him/herself and the entire organization;
- c. Manages schedules, delegates, and allocates resources to promote collegial efforts in school improvement and faculty development; and
- d. Is fiscally responsible and maximizes the impact of fiscal resources on instructional priorities.

Standard 9: Communication. Effective school leaders practice two-way communications and use appropriate oral, written, and electronic communication and collaboration skills to accomplish school and system goals by building and maintaining relationships with students, faculty, parents, and community. The leader:

- a. Actively listens to and learns from students, staff, parents, and community stakeholders;
- b. Recognizes individuals for effective performance;
- c. Communicates student expectations and performance information to students, parents, and community;
- d. Maintains high visibility at school and in the community and regularly engages stakeholders in the work of the school;
- e. Creates opportunities within the school to engage students, faculty, parents, and community stakeholders in constructive conversations about important school issues.
- f. Utilizes appropriate technologies for communication and collaboration; and
- g. Ensures faculty receives timely information about student learning requirements, academic standards, and all other local state and federal administrative requirements and decisions.

Domain 4: Professional and Ethical Behavior:

Standard 10: Professional and Ethical Behaviors. Effective school leaders demonstrate personal and professional behaviors consistent with quality practices in education and as a community leader. The leader:

- a. Adheres to the Code of Ethics and the Principles of Professional Conduct for the Education Profession in Florida, pursuant to Rules 6B-1.001 and 6B-1.006, F.A.C.;
- b. Demonstrates resiliency by staying focused on the school vision and reacting constructively to the barriers to success that include disagreement and dissent with leadership;
- c. Demonstrates a commitment to the success of all students, identifying barriers and their impact on the well-being of the school, families, and local community;
- d. Engages in professional learning that improves professional practice in alignment with the needs of the school system;
- e. Demonstrates willingness to admit error and learn from it; and
- f. Demonstrates explicit improvement in specific performance areas based on previous evaluations and formative feedback.

Rulemaking Authority 1001.02, 1012.34, 1012.55(1), 1012.986(3) FS. Law Implemented 1012.55, 1012.986, 1012.34 FS. History—New 5-24-05, Formerly 6B-5.0012, Amended 12-20-11.

APPENDIX F
FLORIDA EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP EXAMINATION (FELE)

Florida Educational Leadership Examination Competencies and Skills (2008):

Subtest #1: Instructional Leadership

1 Knowledge of instructional leadership standard as related to curriculum development and continuous school improvement process

1. Given a scenario, assess the curriculum and school wide professional development needs of an instructional program.
2. Given a set of school data, identify appropriate objectives and strategies for developing, implementing, assessing, and revising a school improvement plan.
3. Given a school data set, determine an appropriate instructional improvement strategy.
4. Identify functions and implications of various curriculum designs.
5. Given grade-level data on reading, identify strategies to align curriculum, instruction, and assessment.

2 Knowledge of instructional leadership standard as related to research-based best practices

1. Given school-based student assessment data on reading performance, identify research-based reading instruction to improve student achievement.
2. Given school-based student assessment data on reading performance, identify instructional strategies to facilitate students' phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary, and reading comprehension throughout the content areas.
3. Given a scenario, which may include data, identify programs or initiatives that are research based to integrate reading, writing, and mathematics across all subject areas to increase student achievement.
4. Given a description of recurring problems in student performance in a content area, select strategies for engaging teachers in ongoing study of current best practices.
5. Identify scientifically based research applications to effective teaching and learning methods.
6. Identify practices in teacher planning, instructional organization, and classroom management that enhance student learning and achievement.
7. Identify instructional delivery methods that enhance student learning and achievement

3 Knowledge of instructional leadership standard as related to school culture

1. Given data from a school climate survey, identify appropriate strategies for improving student learning.
2. Given data from a school climate survey, identify factors contributing to morale and performance.

4 Knowledge of instructional leadership standard as related to instructional design, teaching, and learning

1. Given taxonomy of learning, identify instructional objectives to facilitate varying levels of learning.
2. Identify age-appropriate learning strategies based on principles of human growth and development.
3. Identify practices for evaluating the appropriateness of instructional strategies.
4. Identify practices for evaluating the appropriateness of instructional materials.

5 Knowledge of instructional leadership standard as related to instructional program for students with special needs

1. Given student special needs characteristics in a specific classroom and walk-through observation notes, identify an appropriate instructional adaptation/modification to provide for students with special needs in that classroom.
2. Given an IEP, determine whether or not provisions made are adequate to meet student needs.

6 Knowledge of instructional leadership standard as related to federal and State law in education and schooling

1. Given a scenario, identify the State requirements for students to participate in interscholastic or extracurricular student activities.
2. Given a scenario, identify employee and student rights and responsibilities under federal statutes.

7 Knowledge of managing the learning environment standard as related to tort and contract liability in the operation of Florida public schools

1. Given a scenario, identify legal standards of negligent tort liability applicable to school employees and districts.
2. Given a scenario, identify legal standards of intentional tort liability applicable to school employees and districts.
3. Given a scenario, identify legal standards that are applicable to site administrators in negotiating contracts for goods and services.

8 Knowledge of managing the learning environment standard as related to funding of Florida schools

1. Given an FTE report, identify, interpret, and apply each formula factor used in computing the Florida Education Finance Program allocation.
2. Given a school budget, identify funding categories available to a school beyond the Florida Education Finance Program allocation.
3. Given a school budget, identify or apply the processes of planning, developing, implementing, and evaluating a budget.

9 Knowledge of managing the learning environment standard as related to financial accounting and auditing

1. Given an FTE audit report (e.g., State, district, or school); identify categories that are out of compliance with Florida Statutes (e.g., attendance records, teacher certification, vocational time cards, ESE and ESOL student records).
2. Given a school internal funds audit report, identify violations of the State Board of Education policies and procedures for the administration and accounting of internal funds (e.g., fund-raisers, purchases, monthly financial reports, bonding of the treasurer).

10 Knowledge of managing the learning environment standard as related to facilities management

1. Given a State request for a school room utilization update, identify the requirements of the Florida Inventory of School Houses as specified in Florida Statutes (e.g., space requirements for ESE, vocational courses, class size reduction).
2. Given a school building's security plan, determine compliance with Florida Statutes and State Board of Education rules.

11 Knowledge of managing the learning environment standard as related to student services

1. Given a school guidance report, determine compliance with Florida Statutes.
2. Given a faculty handbook, identify the duties of school administrators governing student discipline and school safety per Florida Statutes (e.g., zero tolerance, discipline of exceptional students, emergency management plan, Student Code of Conduct).
3. Given a parent request to administer medication, identify the guidelines in Florida Statutes regulating the administration of prescribed medications to students by public school employees.

12 Knowledge of managing the learning environment standard as related to student and parental rights

1. Given the student-parent handbook, determine compliance with Florida Statutes governing parents' rights and responsibilities and/or students' rights and privacy to access student educational records (e.g., deny, release, challenge content, FERPA).
2. Given a scenario, identify standards and procedures applicable to United States Citizenship and Immigration Services and students attending public schools.

13 Knowledge of managing the learning environment standard as related to federal law for education and schooling

1. Given a scenario, identify exceptional education entitlements, equal access for students and staff with disabilities, and related rights under federal statutes.

14 Knowledge of learning, accountability, and assessment standard as related to State law for education and schooling

1. Given a scenario, identify legal standards and procedures applicable to school accountability legislation.
2. Given a scenario, identify the standards and procedures applicable to the META Consent Decree.

15 Knowledge of learning, accountability, and assessment standard as related to measurement of effective student performance

1. Given data (e.g., national, state, district, school, classroom, individual student), analyze student achievement.
2. Given a scenario, determine aspects of adequate progress of the lowest 25% in reading and mathematics at the school level.
3. Given school data sets with differing accountability designations, compare and contrast multiple measures of data to analyze school needs.
4. Given school data, analyze or develop a plan to address statewide requirements for student assessment (e.g., science, reading, mathematics, writing).
5. Given school data, analyze or develop a plan to address national requirements for student assessment (e.g., NCLB science, reading, mathematics, writing).

16 Knowledge of learning, accountability, and assessment standard as related to assessment instruments and their applications

1. Given a scenario, identify the appropriate type of formal assessment instrument (e.g., norm referenced, criterion referenced) to determine student strengths and needs.

2. Given a scenario, identify the appropriate informal assessment instrument (e.g., observations, checklists, inventories, interviews) to determine student strengths and needs.

17 Knowledge of learning, accountability, and assessment standard as related to diagnostic tools to assess, identify, and apply instructional improvement

1. Given a data set of reading test results for students in ESE or ESOL, identify diagnostic tools appropriate for assessing student learning needs.
2. Given a data set of reading test results for students in ESE or ESOL, identify appropriate instructional strategies to improve student performance in reading.

Subtest #2: Operational Leadership

1 Knowledge of technology standard in the use of technology for teaching and learning

1. Given a technology plan, identify hardware, software, and related technologies appropriate to design and delivery of instruction.
2. Given a technology plan to integrate technology to improve student performance in a subject area, identify appropriate technology applications to address student performance needs.

2 Knowledge of technology standard related to school operations

1. Given a school technology plan, assess compliance with State technology goals (e.g., copyright law, Internet usage, digital learning environment, instructional leadership, Florida's digital educators, access to technology, infrastructure, and support).
2. Given a scenario, select computer hardware and software appropriate to school operations.
3. Given a scenario, identify components of a technology infrastructure related to school and student safety.
4. Given a scenario, select Web-based communication applications.
5. Given a scenario, select presentation software applications.

3 Knowledge of human resource development standard as related to recruitment, selection, induction, and retention of staff

1. Given policies for teacher recruitment, selection, induction, professional development, and retention, determine compliance with Florida Statutes and No Child Left Behind legislation.
2. Given an out-of-field teacher report, identify various methods for acquiring Florida Teacher Certification (e.g., highly qualified teachers, critical shortage, special needs).
3. Given a sample of an interview, identify violations of federal and State laws that protect an applicant from job discrimination (e.g., AIDS, civil rights, Americans with Disability Act).

4 Knowledge of human resource development standard as related to performance assessment procedures

1. Given an instructional assessment instrument, determine compliance with Florida Statutes and State Board regulations for employee evaluation (i.e., management of students, maintenance of discipline, knowledge of subject matter, pay for performance, use of technology, and criteria for continual improvement).
2. Given an unsatisfactory performance evaluation, identify the Florida statutory requirements to facilitate employee growth (i.e., the performance improvement plan, notification of deficiencies, conference for the record).

3. Given an individual professional development plan, determine compliance with Florida Statutes governing the School Community Professional Development Act (i.e., requirement to establish and maintain an Individual Professional Development Plan for each teacher).

5 Knowledge of human resource development standard as related to managing personnel records

1. Given a sample of content from an employer's personnel file, determine compliance with Florida Statutes governing personnel files.
2. Given public information requests, determine compliance with Florida Statutes governing access to personnel files and records (e.g., medical records, complaints related to investigation, payroll deduction records, Social Security numbers).

6 Knowledge of human resource development standard as related to processes and procedures for discipline, dismissal, and nonrenewal of school employees

1. Given a recommendation to terminate an employee's contract, identify the school site administrator's responsibilities regarding termination as required in Florida Statutes (e.g., union contract, professional service contract, annual contract, continuing contract).
2. Given case studies with accompanying documentation, identify and apply the Standard of Just Cause for any adverse employment decision as required by Florida Statutes (e.g., dismissal, suspension, demotion, reinstatement).

7 Knowledge of human resource development standard as related to collective bargaining agreements

1. Given a collective bargaining agreement, identify the role of the administrator in managing the contract per Florida Statutes (e.g., grievances, school policies, enforcement, and punitive actions related to all classifications of school personnel).

8 Knowledge of human resource development standard as related to data analysis

1. Given school or classroom data, analyze teacher performance over time.

9 Knowledge of human resource development standard as related to State law for education and schooling

1. Given a scenario, identify standards and procedures applicable to State certification, selection, evaluation, discipline, and reappointment of school district employees.

10 Knowledge of ethical leadership standard as related to ethical conduct

1. Given the Code of Ethics of the Education Profession in Florida, identify violations of ethical conduct as stated in Florida Statutes (e.g., conviction of a crime involving moral turpitude; gross insubordination; misconduct in office; neglect of obligations to students, public, school personnel).

11 Knowledge of ethical leadership standard as related to federal and State law for education and schooling

1. Given a scenario, identify judicially recognized rights and responsibilities guaranteed under the Constitution (e.g., First, Fourth, Fourteenth Amendments).

2. Given a scenario, identify the statutory powers and duties of the Florida Board of Education, Commissioner of Education, local school boards, superintendents, and principals.
3. Given a situation, identify standards and procedures of State administrative law, public disclosure, record keeping, and child welfare.

12 Knowledge of decision-making strategies standard as related to federal and/or State law for education and schooling

1. Given a scenario, identify standards and procedures applicable to federal and/or State statutory provisions for accomplished practices, pupil progression, compulsory school attendance, sexual harassment, charter schools, alternative schools, safe schools, curricula, and facilities.

13 Knowledge of decision-making strategies standard as related to change

1. Apply current concepts of leadership (e.g., systems theory, change theory, situational leadership, visionary leadership, transformational leadership, learning organizations).
2. Select examples of organizational conditions or leadership actions that create positive attitudes toward change.

14 Knowledge of decision-making strategies standard as related to data analysis

1. Given school data, perform procedural measures for school grade calculation.
2. Given a school improvement plan, identify criteria for learning gains of varying subgroups using disaggregated data.

Subtest #3: School Leadership

1 Knowledge of community and stakeholder partnerships standard as related to community relations

1. Select strategies to promote community cooperation and partnerships.

2 Knowledge of community and stakeholder partnerships standard as related to assessment instruments and their applications

1. Given an audience, interpret standardized test results (e.g., percentiles, stanines, raw scores, scale scores).

3 Knowledge of community and stakeholder partnerships standard as related to State law for education and schooling

1. Given a situation, identify reporting procedures of the Florida Department of Law Enforcement's Missing Children program.
2. Given a scenario, interpret school advisory committee requirements as identified in State statutes.

4 Knowledge of community and stakeholder partnerships standard as related to student services

1. Given case studies of students with disabilities, identify the accommodations and services required per Florida Statutes (e.g., diagnostic and learning resource centers, ADA facilities, interagency support services).

5 Knowledge of community and stakeholder partnerships standard as related to student and parental rights and responsibilities

1. Given the student-parent handbook, identify rights and responsibilities of students, parents, and guardians per Florida Statutes (i.e., notification, due

process hearings, student academic progress, school choice preference, health examinations/immunizations, student academic improvement plan, truancy procedures, instructional materials).

6 Knowledge of diversity standard as related to federal and State law for education and schooling and organizational communication

1. Given a scenario, apply legal interpretations of the purpose and intent of federal statutes related to equal access and the prohibition of all forms of discrimination in public schools
2. Given a scenario, identify effective, research-based communication strategies

7 Knowledge of vision standard that works to relate State standards, the needs of the students, the community, and the goals of the school

1. Identify effective strategies for communicating relevant information about State standards, student needs, community needs, and the goals of the school to appropriate stakeholders.
2. Identify effective strategies for communicating relevant information about the instructional program to the community, staff, and district personnel.
3. Identify practices and implications of effective communication and interpersonal relationships.

8 Knowledge of vision standard as related to data analysis

1. Given school data, develop and organize a school action plan that includes methods and approaches to communicate the need for the plan to teachers, students, and the community.

9 Effective writing and data analysis for a school-based application

1. Given a scenario including data, analyze, interpret, and evaluate data for a specific target audience

APPENDIX G
MATRICES ALIGNING EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP COURSES WITH
STANDARDS

ALIGNMENT MATRIX FOR UNIVERSITY OF CENTRAL FLORIDA

EDA 6061 – Organization and Administration of Schools

1. The student will develop an understanding of the appropriateness of various organizational structures.

FEAPS	FELE	FPLS	ISLLC	ELCC (NCATE)
<p>2e: Models clear, acceptable oral and written communication skills</p> <p>5c: Collaborates with home, school and larger communities to foster communication and to support student learning and continuous improvement</p>	<p>.OL Standard 11.1: Given a scenario, identify judicially recognized rights and responsibilities guaranteed under the Constitution (e.g., First, Fourth, Fourteenth Amendments</p> <p>OL Standard 12.1: Given a scenario, identify standards and procedures applicable to federal and/or State statutory provisions for accomplished practices, pupil progression, compulsory school attendance, sexual harassment, charter schools, alternative schools, safe schools, curricula, and facilities.</p>	<p>Standard 8a: Organizes time, tasks and projects effectively with clear objectives and coherent plans</p> <p>Standard 8b: Establishes appropriate deadlines for him/herself and the entire organization</p> <p>Standard 8c: Manages schedules, delegates, and allocates resources to promote collegial efforts in school improvement and faculty development</p> <p>Standard 8d: Is fiscally responsible and maximizes the impact of fiscal resources on instructional priorities</p>	<p>Standard 3: An education leader promotes the success of every student by ensuring management of the organization, operation, and resources for a safe, efficient, and effective learning environment</p>	<p>Standard 1.2: Candidates understand and can collect and use data to identify school goals, assess organizational effectiveness, and implement plans to achieve school goals.</p> <p>Standard 3.1: Candidates understand and can monitor and evaluate school management and operational systems.</p> <p>Standard 3.2: Candidates understand and can efficiently use human, fiscal, and technological resources to manage school operations.</p> <p>Standard 3.5: Candidates understand and can ensure teacher and organizational time focuses on supporting high-quality school instruction and student learning.</p>

2. The student will define various personnel positions and roles.

FEAPS	FELE	FPLS	ISLLC	ELCC (NCATE)
N/A	IL Standard 1.1: Given a scenario, assess the curriculum and school wide professional development needs of an instructional program	Standard 4b: Evaluates, monitors, and provides timely feedback to faculty on the effectiveness of instruction Standard 4c: Employs a faculty with the instructional proficiencies needed for the school population serve Standard 4d: Identifies faculty instructional proficiency needs, including standards-based content, research-based pedagogy, data analysis for instructional planning and improvement, and the use of instructional technology Standard 4e: Implements professional learning that enables faculty to deliver culturally relevant and differentiated instruction Standard 4f: Provides resources and time and engages faculty in effective individual and collaborative professional learning throughout the school year.	Standard 3: An education leader promotes the success of every student by ensuring management of the organization, operation, and resources for a safe, efficient, and effective learning environment, operation, and resources for a safe, efficient, and effective learning environment	Standard 3.2: Candidates understand and can efficiently use human, fiscal, and technological resources to manage school operations.

3. The student will develop knowledge related to student support services.
4. The student will recognize various methods of personnel supervision and support. same as 2
5. The student will define and understand a variety of school support programs. Same as 1
6. The student will understand the importance of legal knowledge

FEAPS	FELE	FPLS	ISLLC	ELCC (NCATE)
N/A	OL Standard 11.3: Given a situation, identify standards and procedures of State administrative law, public disclosure, record keeping, and child welfare. OL Standard 12.1: Given a scenario, identify standards and procedures applicable to federal and/or State statutory provisions for accomplished practices, pupil progression, compulsory school attendance, sexual harassment, charter schools, alternative schools, safe schools, curricula, and facilities	Standard 8a: Organizes time, tasks and projects effectively with clear objectives and coherent plans Standard 8b: Establishes appropriate deadlines for him/herself and the entire organization Standard 8c: Manages schedules, delegates, and allocates resources to promote collegial efforts in school improvement and faculty development Standard 8d: Is fiscally responsible and maximizes the impact of fiscal resources on instructional priorities	Standard 6: An education leader promotes the success of every student by understanding, responding to, and influencing the political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context	Standard 5.4: Candidates understand and can evaluate the potential moral and legal consequences of decision making in the school. Standard 6.2: Candidates understand and can act to influence local, district, state, and national decisions affecting student learning in a school environment.

7. The student will develop basic understanding of school finance. SAME AS 6
8. The student will establish ways to use technology.

FEAPS	FELE	FPLS	ISLLC	ELCC (NCATE)
2g: Integrates current information and communication technologies; 2i: Utilizes current and emerging assistive technologies that enable students to participate in high-quality communication interactions and achieve their educational goals. 3g: Apply varied instructional strategies and resources, including appropriate technology, to provide comprehensible instruction, and to teach for student understanding; 4f: Applies technology to organize and integrate assessment information.	OL Standard 1.1: Given a technology plan, identify hardware, software, and related technologies appropriate to design and delivery of instruction. OL Standard 1.2: Given a technology plan to integrate technology to improve student performance in a subject area, identify appropriate technology applications to address student performance needs.	Standard 4d: Identifies faculty instructional proficiency needs, including standards-based content, research-based pedagogy, data analysis for instructional planning and improvement, and the use of instructional technology; Standard 6e: Uses effective technology integration to enhance decision making and efficiency throughout the school. Standard 9f: Utilizes appropriate technologies for communication and collaboration;	N/A	Standard 2.4: Candidates understand and can promote the most effective and appropriate technologies to support teaching and learning in a school environment Standard 3.2: Candidates understand and can efficiently use human, fiscal, and technological resources to manage school operations.

9. The student will demonstrate methods for research, development, and planning.

FEAPS	FELE	FPLS	ISLLC	ELCC (NCATE)
5b: Examines and uses data-informed research to improve instruction and student achievement;	IL Standard 1.2: Given a set of school data, identify appropriate objectives and strategies for developing, implementing, assessing, and revising a school improvement plan. IL Standard 2.5: Identify scientifically based research applications to effective teaching and learning methods.	Standard 3b: Engages in data analysis for instructional planning and improvement; Standard 4d: Identifies faculty instructional proficiency needs, including standards-based content, research-based pedagogy, data analysis for instructional planning and improvement, and the use of instructional technology;	N/A	Standard 1.2: Candidates understand and can collect and use data to identify school goals, assess organizational effectiveness, and implement plans to achieve school goals. Standard 1.4: Candidates understand and can evaluate school progress and revise school plans supported by school stakeholders. Standard 6.3: Candidates understand and can anticipate and assess emerging trends and initiatives in order to adapt school-based leadership strategies.

10. The student will develop a philosophy of ethical leadership.

FEAPS	FELE	FPLS	ISLLC	ELCC (NCATE)
6: Understanding that educators are held to a high moral standard in a community, the effective educator adheres to the Code of Ethics and the Principles of Professional Conduct of the Education Profession of Florida, pursuant to State Board of Education Rules 6B-1.001 and 6B-1.006, F.A.C. and fulfills the expected obligations to students, the public and the education profession.	OL Standard 10.1: Given the Code of Ethics of the Education Profession in Florida, identify violations of ethical conduct as stated in Florida Statutes (e.g., conviction of a crime involving moral turpitude; gross insubordination; misconduct in office; neglect of obligations to students, public, school personnel).	Standard 10a: Adheres to the Code of Ethics and the Principles of Professional Conduct for the Education Profession in Florida, pursuant to Rules 6B-1.001 and 6B-1.006, F.A.C.	Standard 5: An education leader promotes the success of every student by acting with integrity, fairness, and in an ethical manner	Standard 3.4: Candidates understand and can develop school capacity for distributed leadership. Standard 5.1: Candidates understand and can act with integrity and fairness to ensure a school system of accountability for every student's academic and social success. Standard 5.2: Candidates understand and can model principles of self-awareness, reflective practice, transparency, and ethical behavior as related to their roles within the school. Standard 5.4: Candidates understand and can evaluate the potential moral and legal consequences of decision making in the school.

11. The student will develop an understanding of being a leader who is a reflective practitioner.

FEAPS	FELE	FPLS	ISLLC	ELCC (NCATE)
N/A	OL Standard 13.1: Apply current concepts of leadership (e.g., systems theory, change theory, situational leadership, visionary leadership, transformational leadership, learning organizations).	Standard 6b: Uses critical thinking and problem solving techniques to define problems and identify solutions Standard 7b: Provides evidence of delegation and trust in subordinate leaders Standard 7c: Plans for succession management in key positions Standard 9a: Actively listens to and learns from students, staff, parents, and community stakeholders Standard 10b: Demonstrates resiliency by staying focused on the school vision and reacting constructively to the barriers and their impact on the well-being of the school, families, and local community Standard 10d: Engages in professional learning that improves professional practice in alignment with the needs of the school system Standard 10e: Demonstrates willingness to admit error and learn from it;	N/A	Standard 5.2: Candidates understand and can model principles of self-awareness, reflective practice, transparency, and ethical behavior as related to their roles within the school

EDA 6232: Legal Aspects of School Operations

1. Students will develop knowledge of federal and state laws related to public education.

FEAPS	FELE	FPLS	ISLLC	ELCC (NCATE)
N/A	<p>IL Standard 6.1 Given a scenario, identify the State requirements for students to participate in interscholastic or extracurricular student activities</p> <p>IL Standard 6.2: Given a scenario, identify employee and student rights and responsibilities under federal statutes</p> <p>IL Standard 7.1: Given a scenario, identify legal standards of negligent tort liability applicable to school employees and districts.</p> <p>IL Standard 7.2: Given a scenario, identify legal standards of intentional tort liability applicable to school employees and districts.</p> <p>IL Standard 7.3: Given a scenario, identify legal standards that are applicable to site administrators in negotiating contracts for goods and services.</p> <p>IL Standard 10.1: Given a State request for a school room utilization update, identify the requirements of the Florida Inventory of School Houses as specified in Florida Statutes (e.g., space requirements for ESE, vocational courses, class size reduction).</p> <p>IL Standard 10.2: Given a school building's security plan, determine compliance with Florida Statutes and State Board of Education rules.</p> <p>IL Standard 12.2: Given a scenario, identify standards and procedures applicable to United States Citizenship and Immigration Services and students attending public schools.</p>	<p>Standard 8a: Organizes time, tasks and projects effectively with clear objectives and coherent plans</p> <p>Standard 8b: Establishes appropriate deadlines for him/herself and the entire organization</p> <p>Standard 8c: Manages schedules, delegates, and allocates resources to promote collegial efforts in school improvement and faculty development</p> <p>Standard 8d: Is fiscally responsible and maximizes the impact of fiscal resources on instructional priorities.</p>	<p>Standard 6: An education leader promotes the success of every student by understanding, responding to, and influencing the political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context.</p>	<p>Standard 5.4: Candidates understand and can evaluate the potential moral and legal consequences of decision making in the school.</p> <p>Standard 6.2: Candidates understand and can act to influence local, district, state, and national decisions affecting student learning in a school environment.</p>

	<p><u>FELE</u></p> <p>IL Standard 13.1: Given a scenario, identify exceptional education entitlements, equal access for students and staff with disabilities, and related rights under federal statutes</p> <p>IL Standard 14.1: Given a scenario, identify legal standards and procedures applicable to school accountability legislation</p>			
--	--	--	--	--

2. Students will understand the application of Florida statutes and how they relate to student services, human resources, and facilities.

FEAPS	FELE	FPLS	ISLLC	ELCC (NCATE)
N/A	<p>IL Standard 6.1 Given a scenario, identify the State requirements for students to participate in interscholastic or extracurricular student activities</p> <p>IL Standard 6.2: Given a scenario, identify employee and student rights and responsibilities under federal statutes</p> <p>IL Standard 7.1: Given a scenario, identify legal standards of negligent tort liability applicable to school employees and districts.</p> <p>IL Standard 7.2: Given a scenario, identify legal standards of intentional tort liability applicable to school employees and districts.</p> <p>IL Standard 7.3: Given a scenario, identify legal standards that are applicable to site administrators in negotiating contracts for goods and services.</p> <p>IL Standard 10.1: Given a State request for a school room utilization update, identify the requirements of the Florida Inventory of School Houses as specified in Florida Statutes (e.g., space requirements for ESE, vocational courses, class size reduction).</p> <p>IL Standard 10.2: Given a school building's security plan, determine compliance with Florida Statutes and State Board of Education rules.</p> <p>IL Standard 11.1: Given a school guidance report, determine compliance with Florida Statutes.</p> <p>IL Standard 11.2: Given a faculty handbook, identify the duties of school administrators</p>	<p>Standard 8a: Organizes time, tasks and projects effectively with clear objectives and coherent plans</p> <p>Standard 8b: Establishes appropriate deadlines for him/herself and the entire organization</p> <p>Standard 8c: Manages schedules, delegates, and allocates resources to promote collegial efforts in school improvement and faculty development</p> <p>Standard 8d: Is fiscally responsible and maximizes the impact of fiscal resources on instructional priorities</p>	<p>Standard 6: An education leader promotes the success of every student by understanding, responding to, and influencing the political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context</p>	<p>Standard 5.4: Candidates understand and can evaluate the potential moral and legal consequences of decision making in the school.</p> <p>Standard 6.2: Candidates understand and can act to influence local, district, state, and national decisions affecting student learning in a school environment.</p>

	<p><u>FELE</u></p> <p>governing student discipline and school safety per Florida Statutes (e.g., zero tolerance, discipline of exceptional students, emergency management plan, Student Code of Conduct).</p> <p>IL Standard 11.3: Given a parent request to administer medication, identify the guidelines in Florida Statutes regulating the administration of prescribed medications to students by public school employees.</p> <p>IL Standard 12.1: Given the student-parent handbook, determine compliance with Florida Statutes governing parents' rights and responsibilities and/or students' rights and privacy to access student educational records (e.g., deny, release, challenge content, FERPA).</p>			
--	--	--	--	--

3. Students will identify federal and state laws relative to ESE and ESOL students.

FEAPS	FELE	FPLS	ISLLC	ELCC (NCATE)
<p>2d: Respects students' cultural, linguistic and family background</p>	<p>OL Standard 11.3: Given a situation, identify standards and procedures of State administrative law, public disclosure, record keeping, and child welfare. OL Standard 12.1: Given a scenario, identify standards and procedures applicable to federal and/or State statutory provisions for accomplished practices, pupil progression, compulsory school attendance, sexual harassment, charter schools, alternative schools, safe schools, curricula, and facilities IL Standard 13.1: Given a scenario, identify exceptional education entitlements, equal access for students and staff with disabilities, and related rights under federal statutes</p>	<p>Standard 8c: Manages schedules, delegates, and allocates resources to promote collegial efforts in school improvement and faculty development Standard 8d: Is fiscally responsible and maximizes the impact of fiscal resources on instructional priorities</p>	<p>Standard 6: An education leader promotes the success of every student by understanding, responding to, and influencing the political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context</p>	<p>Standard 5.4: Candidates understand and can evaluate the potential moral and legal consequences of decision making in the school. Standard 6.2: Candidates understand and can act to influence local, district, state, and national decisions affecting student learning in a school environment.</p>

EDA 6240: Educational Financial Affairs

1. Students will develop a working knowledge of finance and budgets in Florida Public Schools.

FEAPS	FELE	FPLS	ISLLC	ELCC (NCATE)
2a: Organizes, allocates, and manages the resources of time, space, and attention;	<p>Standard 8.1: Given an FTE report, identify, interpret, and apply each formula factor used in computing the Florida Education Finance Program allocation. Standard 8.2: Given a school budget, identify funding categories available to a school beyond the Florida Education Finance Program allocation. Standard 8.3: Given a school budget, identify or apply the processes of planning, developing, implementing, and evaluating a budget</p> <p>Standard 9.1: Given an FTE audit report (e.g., State, district, or school), identify categories that are out of compliance with Florida Statutes (e.g., attendance records, teacher certification, vocational time cards, and ESE and ESOL student records).</p> <p>Standard 9.2: Given a school internal funds audit report, identify violations of the State Board of Education policies and procedures for the administration and accounting of internal funds (e.g., fund-raisers, purchases, monthly financial reports, bonding of the treasurer).</p>	<p>Standard 4c: Employs a faculty with the instructional proficiencies needed for the school population served</p> <p>Standard 4d: Identifies faculty instructional proficiency needs, including standards-based content, research-based pedagogy, data analysis for instructional planning and improvement, and the use of instructional technology;</p> <p>Standard 4e: Implements professional learning that enables faculty to deliver culturally relevant and differentiated instruction;</p> <p>Standard 4f: Provides resources and time and engages faculty in effective individual and collaborative professional learning throughout the school year.</p> <p>Standard 8a: Organizes time, tasks and projects effectively with clear objectives and coherent plans</p> <p>Standard 8c: Manages schedules, delegates, and allocates resources to promote collegial efforts in school improvement and faculty development</p> <p>Standard 8d: Is fiscally responsible and maximizes the impact of fiscal resources on instructional priorities</p>	<p>Standard 3: An education leader promotes the success of every student by ensuring management of the organization, operation, and resources for a safe, efficient, and effective learning environment</p> <p>Standard 4: An education leader promotes the success of every student by collaborating with faculty and community members, responding to diverse community interests and needs, and mobilizing community resources</p>	<p>Standard 3.1: Candidates understand and can monitor and evaluate school management and operational systems.</p> <p>Standard 3.2: Candidates understand and can efficiently use human, fiscal, and technological resources to manage school operations.</p> <p>Standard 6.2: Candidates understand and can act to influence local, district, state, and national decisions affecting student learning in a school environment</p>

2. Students will understand and apply Florida Statutes related to school budgeting. Same as 1

EDA 6260: Educational Systems Planning and Management

1. The student will have the opportunity to gain knowledge in the use of technology for both administrative procedures and instructional practices in schools.

FEAPS	FELE	FPLS	ISLLC	ELCC (NCATE)
<p>2g. Integrates current information and communication technologies</p> <p>2i. Utilizes current and emerging assistive technologies that enable students to participate in high-quality communication interactions and achieve their educational goals.</p> <p>3g. Apply varied instructional strategies and resources, including appropriate technology, to provide comprehensible instruction, and to teach for student understanding</p> <p>4f. Applies technology to organize and integrate assessment information</p>	<p>OL Standard 1.1: Given a technology plan, identify hardware, software, and related technologies appropriate to design and delivery of instruction.</p> <p>OL Standard 1.2: Given a technology plan to integrate technology to improve student performance in a subject area, identify appropriate technology applications to address student performance needs</p> <p>OL Standard 2.1 Given a school technology plan, assess compliance with State technology goals (e.g., copyright law, Internet usage, digital learning environment, instructional leadership, Florida’s digital educators, access to technology, infrastructure, support).</p>	<p>Standard 4d: Identifies faculty instructional proficiency needs, including standards-based content, research-based pedagogy, data analysis for instructional planning and improvement, and the use of instructional technology;</p> <p>Standard 6d: Uses effective technology integration to enhance decision making and efficiency throughout the school.</p> <p>Standard 9f: Utilizes appropriate technologies for communication and collaboration;</p>	N/A	<p>Standard 2.4: Candidates understand and can promote the most effective and appropriate technologies to support teaching and learning in a school environment.</p> <p>Standard 3.2: Candidates understand and can efficiently use human, fiscal, and technological resources to manage school operations</p>

2. The student will have the opportunity to gain an understanding that the school and school district mission should drive a plan for technology integration. Same as 1

3. The student will have the opportunity to gain knowledge regarding challenges facing the school leader in integrating technology. Same as 1

4. The student will have the opportunity to learn of the ethical and legal issues involved with integration of technology in schools.

FEAPS	FELE	FPLS	ISLLC	ELCC (NCATE)
<p>6. Understanding that educators are held to a high moral standard in a community, the effective educator adheres to the Code of Ethics and the Principles of Professional Conduct of the Education Profession of Florida, pursuant to State Board of Education Rules 6B-1.001 and 6B-1.006, F.A.C, and fulfills the expected obligations to students, the public and the education profession.</p>	<p>OL Standard 2.3: Given a scenario, identify components of a technology infrastructure related to school and student safety</p>	<p>Standard 10a: Adheres to the Code of Ethics and the Principles of Professional Conduct for the Education Profession in Florida, pursuant to Rules 6B-1.001 and 6B-1.006, F.A.C.</p>	<p>Standard 5: An education leader promotes the success of every student by acting with integrity, fairness, and in an ethical manner</p> <p>Standard 6: An education leader promotes the success of every student by understanding, responding to, and influencing the political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context</p>	<p>Standard 5.1: Candidates understand and can act with integrity and fairness to ensure a school system of accountability for every student’s academic and social success.</p> <p>Standard 5.4: Candidates understand and can evaluate the potential moral and legal consequences of decision making in the school.</p>

5. The student will have the opportunity to become familiar with the Florida Educational Leadership Standards related to technology. SAME AS 1

6. The student will have the opportunity to gain knowledge in the steps involved in developing a school-wide technology plan.

SAME AS 1

7. The student will have the opportunity to develop an understanding of being a leader who is a reflective practitioner.

FEAPS	FELE	FPLS	ISLLC	ELCC (NCATE)
5 d. Engages in targeted professional growth opportunities and reflective practices, both independently and in collaboration with colleagues		Standard 10b: Demonstrates resiliency by staying focused on the school vision and reacting constructively to the barriers to success that include disagreement and dissent with leadership Standard 10d: Engages in professional learning that improves professional practice in alignment with the needs of the school system Standard 10 e: Demonstrates willingness to admit error and learn from it;	N/A	Standard 5.2: Candidates understand and can model principles of self-awareness, reflective practice, transparency, and ethical behavior as related to their roles within the school.

8. The student will have the opportunity to understand what is involved in the change process.

FEAPS	FELE	FPLS	ISLLC	ELCC (NCATE)
N/A	OL Standard 13.1: Apply current concepts of leadership (e.g., systems theory, change theory, situational leadership, visionary leadership, transformational leadership, learning organizations).	N/A	N/A	N/A

9. The student will have the opportunity to understand how to establish a culture to support technology integration. SAME AS 1

10. The student will have the opportunity to gain a familiarity with current trends and topics related to educational technology. SAME AS 1

11. The student will have the opportunity to gain an awareness of the technology, telecommunications, and information systems and their uses to enrich curriculum, instruction, and assessment. SAME AS 1

12. The student will have the opportunity to learn how to develop an effective professional development plan that will support technology integration. SAME AS 1

13. The student will have the opportunity to gain hands-on experience in utilizing the resources and tools available through the William Cecil Golden School.

14. The student will gain an awareness of the outside sources available for funding technology purchases.

15. The student will have the opportunity to acquire an appreciation for the contribution of technology as a motivator to the learner. SAME AS 1

EDA 6300: Community School Relations

1. Develop a sound personal philosophy regarding school-community relations.

FEAPS	FELE	FPLS	ISLLC	ELCC (NCATE)
<p>5c: Collaborates with the home, school and larger communities to foster communication and to support student learning and continuous improvement 5d: Engages in targeted professional growth opportunities and reflective practices, both independently and in collaboration with colleagues;</p>	<p>SL Standard 1.1: Select strategies to promote community cooperation and partnerships SL Standard 3.2: Given a scenario, interpret school advisory committee requirements as identified in State statutes. IL Standard 3.1: Given data from a school climate survey, identify appropriate strategies for improving student learning IL Standard 3.2: Given data from a school climate survey, identify factors contributing to morale and performance.</p>	<p>Standard 9a: Actively listens to and learns from students, staff, parents, and community stakeholders; Standard 9c: Communicates student expectations and performance information to students, parents, and community; Standard 9d: Maintains high visibility at school and in the community and regularly engages stakeholders in the work of the school; Standard 9e: Creates opportunities within the school to engage students, faculty, parents, and community stakeholders in constructive conversations about important school issues. Standard 9f: Utilizes appropriate technologies for communication and collaboration;</p>	<p>Standard 1: An education leader promotes the success of every student by facilitating the development, articulation, implementation, and stewardship of a vision of learning that is shared and supported by all stakeholders Standard 4: Collaborating with faculty and community members, responding to diverse community interests and needs, and mobilizing community resources Standard 6: An education leader promotes the success of every student by understanding, responding to, and influencing the political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context.</p>	<p>Standard 1.1: Candidates understand and can collaboratively develop, articulate, implement, and steward a shared vision of learning for a school Standard 4.1: Candidates understand and can collaborate with faculty and community members by collecting and analyzing information pertinent to the improvement of the school's educational environment. Standard 4.3: Candidates understand and can respond to community interests and needs by building and sustaining positive school relationships with families and caregivers. Standard 4.4: Candidates understand and can respond to community interests and needs by building and sustaining productive school relationships with community partners Standard 6.2: Candidates understand and can act to influence local, district, state, and national decisions affecting student learning in a school environment.</p>

2. Gain an understanding of the manner in which schools and their constituent communities interact. SAME AS 1
3. Understand the importance of speaking and writing clearly in conveying messages.

FEAPS	FELE	FPLS	ISLLC	ELCC (NCATE)
<p>2G: Integrates current information and communication technologies; 2I: Utilizes current and emerging assistive technologies that enable students to participate in high-quality communication interactions and achieve their educational goals.</p>	<p>SL Standard 6.2: Given a scenario, identify effective, research-based communication strategies SL Standard 7.1: Identify effective strategies for communicating relevant information about State standards, student needs, community needs, and the goals of the school to appropriate stakeholders. SL Standard 7.2: Identify effective strategies for communicating relevant information about the instructional program to the community, staff, and district personnel SL Standard 7.3: Identify practices and implications of effective communication and interpersonal relationships. OL Standard 13.2: Select examples of organizational conditions or leadership actions that create positive attitudes toward change</p>	<p>Standard 9c: Communicates student expectations and performance information to students, parents, and community; Standard 9e: Creates opportunities within the school to engage students, faculty, parents, and community stakeholders in constructive conversations about important school issues</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>Standard 1.1: Candidates understand and can collaboratively develop, articulate, implement, and steward a shared vision of learning for a school.</p>

4. Discover how to develop goals, strategies, and policies for an effective school-community relations program. SAME AS 1
5. Develop strategies to communicate effectively with the media. SAME AS 3
6. Recognize the importance of communication with both external and internal publics. SAME AS 3
7. Learn how to develop procedures for crisis communication. SAME AS 3
8. Gain an appreciation of how the political processes at the local, state, and national level impact school-community relations

FEAPS	FELE	FPLS	ISLLC	ELCC (NCATE)
N/A	SL Standard 8.1: Given school data, develop and organize a school action plan that includes methods and approaches to communicate the need for the plan to teachers, students, and the community.	Standard 10b: Demonstrates resiliency by staying focused on the school vision and reacting constructively to the barriers to success that include disagreement and dissent with leadership; Standard 10C: Demonstrates a commitment to the success of all students, identifying barriers and their impact on the well-being of the school, families, and local community; Standard 10d: Engages in professional learning that improves professional practice in alignment with the needs of the school system;	Standard 6: An education leader promotes the success of every student by understanding, responding to, and influencing the political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context	Standard 5.4: Candidates understand and can evaluate the potential moral and legal consequences of decision making in the school. Standard 6.2: Candidates understand and can act to influence local, district, state, and national decisions affecting student learning in a school environment. Standard 6.3: Candidates understand and can anticipate and assess emerging trends and initiatives in order to adapt school-based leadership strategies.

EDA 6502: Organization and Administration of Instructional Programs

1. You will have the opportunity to understand the impact the culture of the school has on student achievement.

FEAPS	FELE	FPLS	ISLLC	ELCC (NCATE)
2d: Respects students' cultural, linguistic and family background; 2h: Adapts the learning environment to accommodate the differing needs and diversity of students; 3 h: Differentiate instruction based on an assessment of student learning needs and recognition of individual differences in students; 4 e: Shares the importance and outcomes of student assessment data with the student and the student's parent/caregiver(s);	IL Standard 14.2: Given a scenario, identify the standards and procedures applicable to the META Consent Decree.	Standard 4e: Implements professional learning that enables faculty to deliver culturally relevant and differentiated instruction Standard 5c: Promotes school and classroom practices that validate and value similarities and differences among students Standard 9c: Communicates student expectations and performance information to students, parents, and community;	Standard 2: An education leader promotes the success of every student by advocating, nurturing, and sustaining a school culture and instructional program conducive to student learning and staff professional growth Standard 4: Collaborating with faculty and community members, responding to diverse community interests and needs, and mobilizing community resources	Standard 4.2: Candidates understand and can mobilize community resources by promoting an understanding, appreciation, and use of diverse cultural, social, and intellectual resources within the school community. Standard 5.3: Candidates understand and can safeguard the values of democracy, equity, and diversity within the school.

2. You will have the opportunity to identify instructional delivery methods that enhance student learning and achievement.

FEAPS	FELE	FPLS	ISLLC	ELCC (NCATE)
<p>1 a: Aligns instruction with state-adopted standards at the appropriate level of rigor</p> <p>1 c: Designs instruction for students to achieve mastery;</p> <p>1 e: Uses a variety of data, independently, and in collaboration with colleagues, to evaluate learning outcomes, adjust planning and continuously improve the effectiveness of the lessons;</p> <p>3 g. Apply varied instructional strategies and resources, including appropriate technology, to provide comprehensible instruction, and to teach for student understanding</p>	<p>IL Standard 1.3: Given a school data set, determine an appropriate instructional improvement strategy</p> <p>IL Standard 1.4: Identify functions and implications of various curriculum designs</p> <p>IL Standard 2.1: Given school-based student assessment data on reading performance, identify research-based reading instruction to improve student achievement</p> <p>IL Standard 2.4: Given a description of recurring problems in student performance in a content area, select strategies for engaging teachers in ongoing study of current best practices.</p> <p>IL Standard 2.5: Identify scientifically based research applications to effective teaching and learning methods</p> <p>IL Standard 2.6: Identify practices in teacher planning, instructional organization, and classroom management that enhance student learning and achievement</p> <p>IL Standard 2.7: Identify instructional delivery methods that enhance student learning and achievement</p>	<p>Standard 3a: Implements the Florida Educator Accomplished Practices as described in Rule 6A-5.065, F.A.C. through a common language of instruction;</p> <p>Standard 3c: Communicates the relationships among academic standards, effective instruction, and student performance</p> <p>Standard 4b: Evaluates, monitors, and provides timely feedback to faculty on the effectiveness of instruction;</p>	<p>Standard 2: An education leader promotes the success of every student by advocating, nurturing, and sustaining a school culture and instructional program conducive to student learning and staff professional growth</p> <p>Standard 3: An education leader promotes the success of every student by ensuring management of the organization, operation, and resources for a safe, efficient, and effective learning environment, operation, and resources for a safe, efficient, and effective learning environment</p>	<p>Standard 2.1: Candidates understand and can sustain a school culture and instructional program conducive to student learning through collaboration, trust, and a personalized learning environment with high expectations for students</p> <p>Standard 2.2: Candidates understand and can create and evaluate a comprehensive, rigorous, and coherent curricular and instructional school program.</p>

3. You will have the opportunity to understand the use of technology in creating a sense of community within a school.

FEAPS	FELE	FPLS	ISLLC	ELCC (NCATE)
2 i: Utilizes current and emerging assistive technologies that enable students to participate in high-quality communication interactions and achieve their educational goals 3 g: Apply varied instructional strategies and resources, including appropriate technology, to provide comprehensible instruction, and to teach for student understanding 4 f: Applies technology to organize and integrate assessment information	N/A	Standard 4d: Identifies faculty instructional proficiency needs, including standards-based content, research-based pedagogy, data analysis for instructional planning and improvement, and the use of instructional technology; Standard 6e: Uses effective technology integration to enhance decision making and efficiency throughout the school. Standard 9f: Utilizes appropriate technologies for communication and collaboration	N/A	Standard 2.4: Candidates understand and can promote the most effective and appropriate technologies to support teaching and learning in a school environment Standard 3.2: Candidates understand and can efficiently use human, fiscal, and technological resources to manage school operations.

4. You will have the opportunity to realize that a collegial relationship among the adults in your school or school district is essential for school improvement to be sustained.

FEAPS	FELE	FPLS	ISLLC	ELCC (NCATE)
2g: Integrates current information and communication technologies; 5 c: Collaborates with the home, school and larger communities to foster communication and to support student learning and continuous improvement	N/A	Standard 2b: Maintains a school climate that supports student engagement in learning; Standard 4a: Generates a focus on student and professional learning in the school that is clearly linked to the system-wide strategic objectives and the school improvement plan Standard 5a: Maintains a safe, respectful and inclusive student-centered learning environment that is focused on equitable opportunities for learning and building a foundation for a fulfilling life in a democratic society and global economy; Standard 7e: Develops sustainable and supportive relationships between school leaders, parents, community, higher education and business leaders	Standard 2: An education leader promotes the success of every student by advocating, nurturing, and sustaining a school culture and instructional program conducive to student learning and staff professional growth Standard 4: Collaborating with faculty and community members, responding to diverse community interests and needs, and mobilizing community resources	Standard 1.1: Candidates understand and can collaboratively develop, articulate, implement, and steward a shared vision of learning for a school. Standard 2.1: Candidates understand and can sustain a school culture and instructional program conducive to student learning through collaboration, trust, and a personalized learning environment with high expectations for students. Standard 4.2: Candidates understand and can mobilize community resources by promoting an understanding, appreciation, and use of diverse cultural, social, and intellectual resources within the school community Standard 6.1: Candidates understand and can advocate for school students, families, and caregivers.

5. You will have the opportunity to gain knowledge of the steps involved in aligning a school’s curriculum, instruction and evaluation.

FEAPS	FELE	FPLS	ISLLC	ELCC (NCATE)
<p>1 a: Aligns instruction with state-adopted standards at the appropriate level of rigor; 4 b: Designs and aligns formative and summative assessments that match learning objectives and lead to mastery;</p>	<p>IL Standard 15.1: Given data (e.g., national, state, district, school, classroom, individual student), analyze student achievement. IL Standard 15.2: Given a scenario, determine aspects of adequate progress of the lowest 25% in reading and mathematics at the school level requirements for student assessment (e.g., NCLB science, reading, mathematics, writing).</p>	<p>Standard 1.a: The school’s learning goals are based on the state’s adopted student academic standards and the district’s adopted curricula Standard 1.b: Student learning results are evidenced by the student performance and growth on statewide assessments; district-determined assessments that are implemented by the district under Section 1008.22, F.S.; international assessments; and other indicators of student success adopted by the district and state. Standard 2a: Enables faculty and staff to work as a system focused on student learning Standard 2b: Generates high expectations for learning growth by all students Standard 3d: Implements the district’s adopted curricula and state’s adopted academic standards in a manner that is rigorous and culturally relevant to the students and school Standard 3e: Ensures the appropriate use of high quality formative and interim assessments aligned with the adopted standards and curricula</p>	<p>Standard 2: An education leader promotes the success of every student by advocating, nurturing, and sustaining a school culture and instructional program conducive to student learning and staff professional growth Standard 3: An education leader promotes the success of every student by ensuring management of the organization, operation, and resources for a safe, efficient, and effective learning environment</p>	<p>Standard 2.1: Candidates understand and can sustain a school culture and instructional program conducive to student learning through collaboration, trust, and a personalized learning environment with high expectations for students Standard 2.2: Candidates understand and can create and evaluate a comprehensive, rigorous, and coherent curricular and instructional school program.</p>

6. You will have the opportunity to identify the conditions in a school that both enable and distract from the success of school improvement initiatives. N/A

7. You will have the opportunity to understand that the school or school district vision and mission should drive all planning and decision making regarding instructional programs.

FEAPS	FELE	FPLS	ISLLC	ELCC (NCATE)
N/A	N/A	Standard 3d: Implements the district's adopted curricula and state's adopted academic standards in a manner that is rigorous and culturally relevant to the students and school Standard 4b: Generates a focus on student and professional learning in the school that is clearly linked to the system-wide strategic objectives and the school improvement plan Standard 10d: Engages in professional learning that improves professional practice in alignment with the needs of the school system	Standard 1: An education leader promotes the success of every student by facilitating the development, articulation, implementation, and stewardship of a vision of learning that is shared and supported by all stakeholders Standard 2: An education leader promotes the success of every student by advocating, nurturing, and sustaining a school culture and instructional program conducive to student learning and staff professional growth	Standard 1.1: Candidates understand and can collaboratively develop, articulate, implement, and steward a shared vision of learning for a school. Standard 1.3: Candidates understand and can promote continual and sustainable school improvement. Standard 2.2: Candidates understand and can create and evaluate a comprehensive, rigorous, and coherent curricular and instructional school program.

8. You will have the opportunity to understand the concept of Fail-Safe Literacy Leadership. FEAPS

FEAPS	FELE	FPLS	ISLLC	ELCC (NCATE)
2b. Deepen and enrich students' understanding through content area literacy strategies, verbalization of thought, and application of the subject matter	IL Standard 2.1: Given school-based student assessment data on reading performance, identify research-based reading instruction to improve student achievement. IL Standard 2.2: Given school-based student assessment data on reading performance, identify instructional strategies to facilitate students' phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary, and reading comprehension throughout the content areas	N/A	N/A	N/A

9. You will have the opportunity to gain knowledge on the steps involved in promoting literacy learning among school faculty and staff. Same as 8

10. You will have the opportunity to given data (e.g., national, state, district, school, classroom, individual student), will be able to analyze student achievement.

FEAPS	FELE	FPLS	ISLLC	ELCC (NCATE)
<p>1 e. Uses a variety of data, independently, and in collaboration with colleagues, to evaluate learning outcomes, adjust planning and continuously improve the effectiveness of the lessons;</p> <p>3 c. Identify gaps in students' subject matter knowledge</p> <p>3 h. Differentiate instruction based on an assessment of student learning needs and recognition of individual differences in students</p> <p>4 h. Differentiate instruction based on an assessment of student learning needs and recognition of individual differences in students</p> <p>5 b. Examines and uses data-informed research to improve instruction and student achievement;</p>	<p>IL Standard 15.3: Given school data sets with differing accountability designations, compare and contrast multiple measures of data to analyze school needs.</p> <p>IL Standard 15.4: Given school data, analyze or develop a plan to address statewide requirements for student assessment (e.g., science, reading, mathematics, writing).</p> <p>IL Standard 15.5: Given school data, analyze or develop a plan to address national requirements for student assessment (e.g., NCLB science, reading, mathematics, writing).</p>	<p>Standard 1b: Student learning results are evidenced by the student performance and growth on statewide assessments; district-determined assessments that are implemented by the district under Section 1008.22, F.S.; international assessments; and other indicators of student success adopted by the district and state</p> <p>Standard 3b: Engages in data analysis for instructional planning and improvement</p> <p>Standard 3e: Ensures the appropriate use of high quality formative and interim assessments aligned with the adopted standards and curricula</p> <p>Standard 5f: Engages faculty in recognizing and understanding cultural and developmental issues related to student learning by identifying and addressing strategies to minimize and/or eliminate achievement gaps.</p>	<p>Standard 1: An education leader promotes the success of every student by facilitating the development, articulation, implementation, and stewardship of a vision of learning that is shared and supported by all stakeholders</p> <p>Standard 4: Collaborating with faculty and community members, responding to diverse community interests and needs, and mobilizing community resources</p>	<p>Standard 1.2: Candidates understand and can collect and use data to identify school goals, assess organizational effectiveness, and implement plans to achieve school goals.</p> <p>Standard 4.1: Candidates understand and can collaborate with faculty and community members by collecting and analyzing information pertinent to the improvement of the school's educational environment</p>

11. You will have the opportunity to, given a scenario, will be able to determine aspects of adequate progress of the lowest 25% in reading and mathematics at the school level. SAME AS 10
12. You will have the opportunity to given school data sets, will be able to analyze the data and develop teaching practices to address any of the weaknesses in student improvement generated by the data analysis. SAME AS 10
13. You will have the opportunity to gain knowledge of the concept nonnegotiable expectations. N/A
14. You will have the opportunity to identify and create instructional exemplars N/A
15. You will have the opportunity to gain knowledge of the critical characteristics of an effective leader.

FEAPS	FELE	FPLS	ISLLC	ELCC (NCATE)
N/A	OL Standard 13.1: Apply current concepts of leadership (e.g., systems theory, change theory, situational leadership, visionary leadership, transformational leadership, learning organizations). OL Standard 13.2: Select examples of organizational conditions or leadership actions that create positive attitudes toward change	Standard 10a: Adheres to the Code of Ethics and the Principles of Professional Conduct for the Education Profession in Florida, pursuant to Rules 6B-1.001 and 6B-1.006, F.A.C. Standard 10b: Demonstrates resiliency by staying focused on the school vision and reacting constructively to the barriers to success that include disagreement and dissent with leadership Standard 10e: Demonstrates willingness to admit error and learn from it	Standard 5: An education leader promotes the success of every student by acting with integrity, fairness, and in an ethical manner Standard 6: An education leader promotes the success of every student by understanding, responding to, and influencing the political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context	Standard 5.2: Candidates understand and can model principles of self-awareness, reflective practice, transparency, and ethical behavior as related to their roles within the school Standard 6.3: Candidates understand and can anticipate and assess emerging trends and initiatives in order to adapt school-based leadership strategies.

16. You will have the opportunity to gain knowledge of the process involved in creating a learning community within your school or school district.
17. You will have the opportunity to, given a school data set, to be able to determine an appropriate instructional improvement strategy. SAME AS 10
18. You will have the opportunity to become aware of how to design a faculty and staff meeting agenda to promote literacy. Same as 8
19. You will have the opportunity to understand that the purpose of schools and schooling is for the promotion and teaching of literacy. Same as 8

20. You will have the opportunity to gain an appreciation for the contribution of teacher empowerment.

FEAPS	FELE	FPLS	ISLLC	ELCC (NCATE)
N/A	N/A	Standard 4b: Evaluates, monitors, and provides timely feedback to faculty on the effectiveness of instruction Standard 6d: Empowers others and distributes leadership when appropriate Standard 7a: Identifies and cultivates potential and emerging leaders Standard 7b: Provides evidence of delegation and trust in subordinate leaders Standard 9b: Recognizes individuals for effective performance	Standard 2: An education leader promotes the success of every student by advocating, nurturing, and sustaining a school culture and instructional program conducive to student learning and staff professional growth Standard 3: An education leader promotes the success of every student by ensuring management of the organization, operation, and resources for a safe, efficient, and effective learning environment operation, and resources for a safe, efficient, and effective learning environment	Standard 3.4: Candidates understand and can develop school capacity for distributed leadership.

21. You will have the opportunity to understand the power of data in setting a foundation for school change and improvement. SAME AS 10
22. You will have the opportunity to understand the process of change. N/A
23. You will have the opportunity to gain knowledge on implementing and monitoring a fail-safe literacy learning initiative. N/A
24. You will have the opportunity to gain knowledge on the effective use of committees in planning for change. N/A
25. You will have the opportunity to gain knowledge on the process and steps involved in data analysis. SAME AS 10
26. You will have the opportunity to gain knowledge and experience with effective communication.

FEAPS	FELE	FPLS	ISLLC	ELCC (NCATE)
2 e. Models clear, acceptable oral and written communication skills; 5 c. Collaborates with the home, school and larger communities to foster communication and to support student learning and continuous improvement	SL Standard 6.2: Given a scenario, identify effective, research-based communication strategies SL Standard 7.1: Identify effective strategies for communicating relevant information about State standards, student needs, community needs, and the goals of the school to appropriate stakeholders. SL Standard 7.2: Identify effective strategies for communicating relevant information about the instructional program to the community, staff, and district personnel SL Standard 7.3: Identify practices and implications of effective communication and interpersonal relationships.	Standard 3c: Communicates the relationships among academic standards, effective instruction, and student performance Standard 4b: Evaluates, monitors, and provides timely feedback to faculty on the effectiveness of instruction; Standard 5d: Provides recurring monitoring and feedback on the quality of the learning environment; Standard 9a: Actively listens to and learns from students, staff, parents, and community stakeholders Standard 9c: Communicates student expectations and performance information to students, parents, and community Standard 9f: Utilizes appropriate technologies for communication and collaboration Standard 9g: Ensures faculty receives timely information about student learning requirements, academic standards, and all other local state and federal administrative requirements and decisions.	Standard 2: An education leader promotes the success of every student by advocating, nurturing, and sustaining a school culture and instructional program conducive to student learning and staff professional growth Standard 4: Collaborating with faculty and community members, responding to diverse community interests and needs, and mobilizing community resources	Standard 1.1: Candidates understand and can collaboratively develop, articulate, implement, and steward a shared vision of learning for a school. Standard 4.1: Candidates understand and can collaborate with faculty and community members by collecting and analyzing information pertinent to the improvement of the school's educational environment. Standard 4.3: Candidates understand and can respond to community interests and needs by building and sustaining positive school relationships with families and caregivers.

EDA 6931: Contemporary Issues in Educational Leadership

1.To understand and be able to explain current concepts of educational leadership: systems theory, shared decision making, situational leadership, visionary leadership, and transformational leadership.

FEAPS	FELE	FPLS	ISLLC	ELCC (NCATE)
N/A	<p>OL Standard 13.1: Apply current concepts of leadership (e.g., systems theory, change theory, situational leadership, visionary leadership, transformational leadership, learning organizations).</p> <p>OL Standard 13.2: Select examples of organizational conditions or leadership actions that create positive attitudes toward change</p>	<p>Standard 6a: Uses critical thinking and problem solving techniques to define problems and identify solutions</p> <p>Standard 6d: Empowers others and distributes leadership when appropriate;</p> <p>Standard 7a: Identifies and cultivates potential and emerging leaders</p> <p>Standard 7b: Provides evidence of delegation and trust in subordinate leaders</p> <p>Standard 7c: Plans for succession management in key positions</p> <p>Standard 10b: Demonstrates resiliency by staying focused on the school vision and reacting constructively to the barriers to success that include disagreement and dissent with leadership</p>	<p>Standard 1: An education leader promotes the success of every student by facilitating the development, articulation, implementation, and stewardship of a vision of learning that is shared and supported by all stakeholders</p> <p>Standard 3: An education leader promotes the success of every student by ensuring management of the organization, operation, and resources for a safe, efficient, and effective learning environment</p> <p>Standard 5: An education leader promotes the success of every student by acting with integrity, fairness, and in an ethical manner</p> <p>Standard 6: An education leader promotes the success of every student by understanding, responding to, and influencing the political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context.</p>	<p>Standard 1.3: Candidates understand and can promote continual and sustainable school improvement</p> <p>Standard 2.3: Candidates understand and can develop and supervise the instructional and leadership capacity of school staff.</p> <p>Standard 3.4: Candidates understand and can develop school capacity for distributed leadership.</p> <p>Standard 6.3: Candidates understand and can anticipate and assess emerging trends and initiatives in order to adapt school-based leadership strategies.</p>

2. To identify and have the knowledge to converse with other educational leaders regarding issues and problems facing current practicing school leaders. SAME AS 1
3. To develop a plan of improvement to enhance student outcomes and move a school toward reaching the goal of being a high performing school.

FEAPS	FELE	FPLS	ISLLC	ELCC (NCATE)
<p>1c. Designs instruction for students to achieve mastery</p> <p>1e. Uses a variety of data, independently, and in collaboration with colleagues, to evaluate learning outcomes, adjust planning and continuously improve the effectiveness of the lessons</p> <p>3c. Identify gaps in students' subject matter knowledge</p> <p>4a. Analyzes and applies data from multiple assessments and measure to diagnose students' learning needs, informs instruction based on those needs, and drives the learning process</p>	<p>IL Standard 15.1: Given data (e.g., national, state, district, school, classroom, individual student), analyze student achievement</p> <p>IL Standard 15.2: Given a scenario, determine aspects of adequate progress of the lowest 25% in reading and mathematics at the school level.</p> <p>IL Standard 15.4: Given school data, analyze or develop a plan to address statewide requirements for student assessment (e.g., science, reading, mathematics, writing).</p> <p>OL Standard 14.1: Given school data, perform procedural measures for school grade calculation</p> <p>OL Standard 14.2: Given a school improvement plan, identify criteria for learning gains of varying subgroups using disaggregated data</p>	<p>Standard 1b: Student learning results are evidenced by the student performance and growth on statewide assessments; district-determined assessments that are implemented by the district under Section 1008.22, F.S.; international assessments; and other indicators of student success adopted by the district and state.</p> <p>Standard 2c: Generates high expectations for learning growth by all students</p> <p>Standard 3b: Engages in data analysis for instructional planning and improvement;</p> <p>Standard 3c: Communicates the relationships among academic standards, effective instruction, and student performance</p> <p>Standard 3e: Ensures the appropriate use of high quality formative and interim assessments aligned with the adopted standards and curricula</p> <p>Standard 4a: Generates a focus on student and professional learning in the school that is clearly linked to the system-wide strategic objectives and the school improvement plan</p>	<p>Standard 1: An education leader promotes the success of every student by facilitating the development articulation, implementation, and stewardship of a vision of learning that is shared and supported by all stakeholders.</p> <p>Standard 2: An education leader promotes the success of every student by advocating, nurturing, and sustaining a school culture and instructional program conducive to student learning and staff professional growth</p> <p>Standard 5: An education leader promotes the success of every student by acting with integrity, fairness, and in an ethical manner.</p>	<p>Standard 1.2: Candidates understand and can collect and use data to identify school goals, assess organizational effectiveness, and create and implement plans to achieve school goals.</p> <p>Standard 1.3: Candidates understand and can promote continual and sustainable school improvement.</p> <p>Standard 2.2: Candidates understand and can create and evaluate a comprehensive, rigorous, and coherent curricular and instructional school program</p> <p>Standard 3.5: Candidates understand and can ensure that teacher and organizational time focuses on supporting high-quality school instruction and student learning</p>

4. To have in-depth knowledge on a particular contemporary issue in education and to be able to cite the research pertinent to that issue. N/A
5. To be aware of the most current legislation enacted and the legislation being considered, and the impact that this legislation will have on schools and the students of Florida.

FEAPS	FELE	FPLS	ISLLC	ELCC (NCATE)
N/A	OL Standard 12.1: Given a scenario, identify standards and procedures applicable to federal and/or State statutory provisions for accomplished practices, pupil progression, compulsory school attendance, sexual harassment, charter schools, alternative schools, safe schools, curricula, and facilities	Standard 9g: Ensures faculty receives timely information about student learning requirements, academic standards, and all other local state and federal administrative requirements and decisions	Standard 6: An education leader promotes the success of every student by understanding, responding to, and influencing the political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context.	Standard 6.2: Candidates understand and can act to influence local, district, state, and national decisions affecting student learning in a school environment. Standard 6.3: Candidates understand and can anticipate and assess emerging trends and initiatives in order to adapt school-based leadership strategies.

6. To utilize reflective thinking and teamwork to analyze and develop strategies to resolve relevant educational leadership issues and problems.

FEAPS	FELE	FPLS	ISLLC	ELCC (NCATE)
<p>5d. Engages in targeted professional growth opportunities and reflective practices, both independently and in collaboration with colleagues; 5e. Implements knowledge and skills learned in professional development in the teaching and learning process</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>Standard 4d: Identifies faculty instructional proficiency needs, including standards-based content, research-based pedagogy, data analysis for instructional planning and improvement, and the use of instructional technology; Standard 6c: Evaluates decisions for effectiveness, equity, intended and actual outcome; implements follow-up actions; and revises as needed Standard 6e: Uses effective technology integration to enhance decision making and efficiency throughout the school Standard 7e: Develops sustainable and supportive relationships between school leaders, parents, community, higher education and business leaders Standard 9a: Actively listens to and learns from students, staff, parents, and community stakeholders Standard 9e: Creates opportunities within the school to engage students, faculty, parents, and community stakeholders in constructive conversations about important school issues</p>	<p>Standard 1: An education leader promotes the success of every student by facilitating the development, articulation, implementation, and stewardship of a vision of learning that is shared and supported by all stakeholders Standard 3: An education leader promotes the success of every student by ensuring management of the organization, operation, and resources for a safe, efficient, and effective learning environment Standard 5: An education leader promotes the success of every student by acting with integrity, fairness, and in an ethical manner Standard 6: An education leader promotes the success of every student by understanding, responding to, and influencing the political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context.</p>	<p>Standard 1.3: Candidates understand and can promote continual and sustainable school improvement. Standard 3.4: Candidates understand and can develop school capacity for distributed leadership. Standard 4.1: Candidates understand and can collaborate with faculty and community members by collecting and analyzing information pertinent to the improvement of the school's educational environment. Standard 4.3: Candidates understand and can respond to community interests and needs by building and sustaining positive school relationships with families and caregivers. Standard 5.2: Candidates understand and can model principles of self-awareness, reflective practice, transparency, and ethical behavior as related to their roles within the school.</p>

EDS 6123– Educational Supervisory Practices I

1. The student will develop a theoretical foundation for instructional supervisory behavior as such relates to human behavior and learning, leadership, motivation, communication, decision making, power and negotiating, and conflict resolutions.

FEAPS	FELE	FPLS	ISLLC	ELCC (NCATE)
N/A	<p>IL Standard 2.4: Given a description of recurring problems in student performance in a content area, select strategies for engaging teachers in ongoing study of current best practice</p> <p>IL Standard 2.6: Identify practices in teacher planning, instructional organization, and classroom management that enhance student learning and achievement.</p> <p>IL Standard 4.1: Given taxonomy of learning, identify instructional objectives to facilitate varying levels of learning</p> <p>IL Standard 4.2: Identify age-appropriate learning strategies based on principles of human growth and development</p> <p>IL Standard 4.3: Identify practices for evaluating the appropriateness of instructional strategies</p> <p>IL Standard 4.4: Identify practices for evaluating the appropriateness of instructional materials</p> <p>OL Standard 9.1: Given a scenario, identify standards and procedures applicable to State certification, selection, evaluation, discipline, and reappointment of school district employees</p> <p>OL Standard 12.1: Given a scenario, identify standards and procedures applicable to federal and/or State statutory provisions for accomplished practices, pupil progression, compulsory school attendance, sexual harassment, charter schools, alternative schools, safe schools, curricula, and facilities</p>	<p>Standard 2a: Enables faculty and staff to work as a system focused on student learning.</p> <p>Standard 2d: Engages faculty and staff in efforts to close learning performance gaps among student subgroups within the school</p> <p>Standard 3d: Implements the district’s adopted curricula and state’s adopted academic standards in a manner that is rigorous and culturally relevant to the students and school</p> <p>Standard 3e: Ensures the appropriate use of high quality formative and interim assessments aligned with the adopted standards and curricula</p> <p>Generates a focus on student and professional learning in the school that is clearly linked to the system-wide strategic objectives and the school improvement plan</p> <p>Standard 4a: Generates a focus on student and professional learning in the school that is clearly linked to the system-wide strategic objectives and the school improvement plan</p> <p>Standard 4d: Identifies faculty instructional proficiency needs, including standards-based content, research-based pedagogy, data analysis for instructional planning and improvement, and the use of instructional technology</p> <p>Standard 5e: Initiates and supports continuous improvement processes focused on the students’ opportunities for success</p>	<p>Standard 1: An education leader promotes the success of every student by facilitating the development, articulation, implementation, and stewardship of a vision of learning that is shared and supported by all stakeholders</p> <p>Standard 2: An education leader promotes the success of every student by advocating, nurturing, and sustaining a school culture and instructional program conducive to student learning and staff professional growth</p> <p>Standard 6: An education leader promotes the success of every student by understanding, responding to, and influencing the political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context.</p>	<p>Standard 1.2: Candidates understand and can collect and use data to identify school goals, assess organizational effectiveness, and implement plans to achieve school goals.</p> <p>Standard 1.3: Candidates understand and can promote continual and sustainable school improvement.</p> <p>Standard 2.3: Candidates understand and can develop and supervise the instructional and leadership capacity of school staff.</p> <p>Standard 3.2: Candidates understand and can efficiently use human, fiscal, and technological resources to manage school operations</p> <p>Standard 3.3: Candidates understand and can promote school-based policies and procedures that protect the welfare and safety of students and staff within the school.</p> <p>Standard 3.4: Candidates understand and can develop school capacity for distributed leadership.</p> <p>Standard 4.1: Candidates understand and can collaborate with faculty and community members by collecting and analyzing information pertinent to the improvement of the school’s educational environment</p> <p>Standard 4.2: Candidates understand and can mobilize community resources by promoting an understanding, appreciation, and use of diverse cultural, social, and intellectual resources within the school community.</p>

	<p align="center"><u>FELE</u></p> <p>OL Standard 13.1: Apply current concepts of leadership (e.g., systems theory, change theory, situational leadership, visionary leadership, transformational leadership, learning organizations).</p>	<p align="center"><u>FPLS</u></p> <p>and well-being. Standard 6b: Uses critical thinking and problem solving techniques to define problems and identify solutions Standard 6c: Evaluates decisions for effectiveness, equity, intended and actual outcome; implements follow-up actions; and revises as needed Standard 6d: Empowers others and distributes leadership when appropriate Standard 8c: Manages schedules, delegates, and allocates resources to promote collegial efforts in school improvement and faculty development Standard 10c: Demonstrates a commitment to the success of all students, identifying barriers and their impact on the well-being of the school, families, and local community</p>		<p align="center"><u>ELCC/NCATE</u></p> <p>Standard 4.3: Candidates understand and can respond to community interests and needs by building and sustaining positive school relationships with families and caregivers. Standard 4.4: Candidates understand and can respond to community interests and needs by building and sustaining productive school relationships with community partners. Standard 5.2: Candidates understand and can model principles of self-awareness, reflective practice, transparency, and ethical behavior as related to their roles within the school. Standard 5.4: Candidates understand and can evaluate the potential moral and legal consequences of decision making in the school. Standard 5.5: Candidates understand and can promote social justice within the school to ensure that individual student needs inform all aspects of schooling. Standard 6.1: Candidates understand and can advocate for school students, families, and caregivers. Standard 6.2: Candidates understand and can act to influence local, district, state, and national decisions affecting student learning in a school environment. Standard 6.3: Candidates understand and can anticipate and assess emerging trends and initiatives in order to adapt school-based leadership strategies</p>
--	---	---	--	--

2. The student will analyze case studies, participate in activities, and develop an understanding of human behavior, leadership and organizational behaviors within the learning environment. Same as 1
3. Students will participate in "Role Playing" activities and develop skills related to decision making and conflict resolution. N/A
4. The student will demonstrate communication skills which emphasize toward effective conflict resolution, negotiations, and motivation.

FEAPS	FELE	FPLS	ISLLC	ELCC (NCATE)
5c: Collaborates with the home, school and larger communities to foster communication and to support student learning and continuous improvement	OL Standard 13.1: Apply current concepts of leadership (e.g., systems theory, change theory, situational leadership, visionary leadership, transformational leadership, learning organizations). SL Standard 8.1: Given school data, develop and organize a school action plan that includes methods and approaches to communicate the need for the plan to teachers, students, and the community.	Standard 2d: Engages faculty and staff in efforts to close learning performance gaps among student subgroups within the school. Standard 3c: Communicates the relationships among academic standards, effective instruction, and student performance Standard 4b: Evaluates, monitors, and provides timely feedback to faculty on the effectiveness of instruction Standard 5d: Provides recurring monitoring and feedback on the quality of the learning environment Standard 9c: Communicates student expectations and performance information to students, parents, and community Standard 9f: Utilizes appropriate technologies for communication and collaboration Standard 9g: Ensures faculty receives timely information about student learning requirements, academic standards, and all other local state and federal administrative requirements and decisions	Standard 4: An education leader promotes the success of every student by collaborating with faculty and community members, responding to diverse community interests and needs, and mobilizing community resources.	Standard 4.1: Candidates understand and can collaborate with faculty members by collecting and analyzing information pertinent to the improvement of the school's educational environment Standard 4.3: Candidates understand and can respond to community interests and needs by building and sustaining positive school relationships with families and caregivers

5. The student will demonstrate skills required for the reflective practitioner to serve as a personnel supervisor throughout the education setting.

FEAPS	FELE	FPLS	ISLLC	ELCC (NCATE)
N/A	<p>OL Standard 3.1: Given policies for teacher recruitment, selection, induction, professional development, and retention, determine compliance with Florida Statutes and No Child Left Behind legislation.</p> <p>OL Standard 3.2: Given an out-of-field teacher report, identify various methods for acquiring Florida Teacher Certification (e.g., highly qualified teachers, critical shortage, special needs), transformational leadership, learning organizations).</p> <p>OL Standard 4.1: Given an instructional assessment instrument, determine compliance with Florida Statutes and State Board regulations for employee evaluation (i.e., management of students, maintenance of discipline, knowledge of subject matter, pay for performance, use of technology, and criteria for continual improvement).</p> <p>OL Standard 4.2: Given an unsatisfactory performance evaluation, identify the Florida statutory requirements to facilitate employee growth (i.e., the performance improvement plan, notification of deficiencies, conference for the record).</p> <p>OL Standard 4.3: Given an individual professional development plan, determine compliance with Florida Statutes governing the School Community Professional Development Act (i.e., requirement to establish and maintain an Individual Professional Development Plan for</p>	<p>Standard 4b: Evaluates, monitors, and provides timely feedback to faculty on the effectiveness of instruction</p> <p>Standard 4d: Identifies faculty instructional proficiency needs, including standards-based content, research-based pedagogy, data analysis for instructional planning and improvement, and the use of instructional technology</p> <p>Standard 6a: Gives priority attention to decisions that impact the quality of student learning and teacher proficiency</p> <p>Standard 7d: Promotes teacher-leadership functions focused on instructional proficiency and student learning;</p> <p>Standard 8c: Manages schedules, delegates, and allocates resources to promote collegial efforts in school improvement and faculty development</p> <p>Standard 9b: Recognizes individuals for effective performance</p>	<p>Standard 3: An education leader promotes the success of every student by ensuring management of the organization, operation, and resources for a safe, efficient, and effective learning environment</p> <p>Standard 4: An education leader promotes the success of every student by collaborating with faculty and community members, responding to diverse community interests and needs, and mobilizing community resources.</p> <p>Standard 5: An education leader promotes the success of every student by acting with integrity, fairness, and in an ethical manner</p>	<p>Standard 3.1: Candidates understand and can monitor and evaluate school management and operational systems</p> <p>Standard 3.2: Candidates understand and can efficiently use human, fiscal, and technological resources to manage school operations.</p> <p>Standard 3.5: Candidates understand and can ensure teacher and organizational time focuses on supporting high-quality school instruction and student learning.</p> <p>Standard 5.2: Candidates understand and can model principles of self-awareness, reflective practice, transparency, and ethical behavior as related to their roles within the school.</p>

	<p style="text-align: center;">FELE</p> <p>each teacher).</p> <p>OL: Standard 5.1: Given a sample of content from an employer's personnel file, determine compliance with Florida Statutes governing personnel files</p> <p>OL Standard 5.2: Given public information requests, determine compliance with Florida Statutes governing access to personnel files and records (e.g., medical records, complaints related to investigation, payroll deduction records, Social Security numbers)</p> <p>OL Standard 6.1: Given a recommendation to terminate an employee's contract, identify the school site administrator's responsibilities regarding termination as required in Florida Statutes (e.g., union contract, professional service contract, annual contract, continuing contract).</p> <p>OL Standard 6.2: Given case studies with accompanying documentation, identify and apply the Standard of Just Cause for any adverse employment decision as required by Florida Statutes (e.g., dismissal, suspension, demotion, reinstatement).</p> <p>OL Standard 9.1: Given a scenario, identify standards and procedures applicable to State certification, selection, evaluation, discipline, and reappointment of school district employees.</p>			
--	--	--	--	--

EDS 6130: Educational Supervisory Practices II

1. Students will acquire a working knowledge of the Florida Performance Measurement System and other measurement systems current in the field.
2. Students will develop a compilation of research related to effective teaching practices.

FEAPS	FELE	FPLS	ISLLC	ELCC (NCATE)
<p>5b: Examines and uses data-informed research to improve instruction and student achievement</p> <p>5d: Engages in targeted professional growth opportunities and reflective practices, both independently and in collaboration with colleagues;</p> <p>5e: Implements knowledge and skills learned in professional development in the teaching and learning process</p>	<p>IL Standard 1.2: Given a set of school data, identify appropriate objectives and strategies for developing, implementing, assessing, and revising a school improvement plan</p> <p>IL Standard 1.4: Identify functions and implications of various curriculum designs</p> <p>IL Standard 2.3: Given a scenario, which may include data, identify programs or initiatives that are research based to integrate reading, writing, and mathematics across all subject areas to increase student achievement.</p> <p>IL Standard 2.5: Identify scientifically based research applications to effective teaching and learning methods</p> <p>IL Standard 3.2: Given data from a school climate survey, identify factors contributing to morale and performance</p>	<p>Standard 4b: Identifies faculty instructional proficiency needs, including standards-based content, research-based pedagogy, data analysis for instructional planning and improvement, and the use of instructional technology</p> <p>Standard 4d: Provides resources and time and engages faculty in effective individual and collaborative professional learning throughout the school year.</p>	<p>Standard 2: An education leader promotes the success of every student by advocating, nurturing, and sustaining a school culture and instructional program conducive to student learning and staff professional growth</p>	<p>Standard 2.2: Candidates understand and can create and evaluate a comprehensive, rigorous, and coherent curricular and instructional school program</p> <p>Standard 3.5: Candidates understand and can ensure teacher and organizational time focuses on supporting high-quality school instruction and student learning</p> <p>Standard 4.1: Candidates understand and can collaborate with faculty and community members by collecting and analyzing information pertinent to the improvement of the school's educational environment</p>

3. Students will acquire a working knowledge of various models of performance observation, supervision and evaluation.

FEAPS	FELE	FPLS	ISLLC	ELCC (NCATE)
N/A	<p>OL Standard 3.1: Given policies for teacher recruitment, selection, induction, professional development, and retention, determine compliance with Florida Statutes and No Child Left Behind legislation.</p> <p>OL Standard 3.2: Given an out-of-field teacher report, identify various methods for acquiring Florida Teacher Certification (e.g., highly qualified teachers, critical shortage, special needs). transformational leadership, learning organizations).</p> <p>OL Standard 4.1: Given an instructional assessment instrument, determine compliance with Florida Statutes and State Board regulations for employee evaluation (i.e., management of students, maintenance of discipline, knowledge of subject matter, pay for performance, use of technology, and criteria for continual improvement).</p> <p>OL Standard 4.2: Given an unsatisfactory performance evaluation, identify the Florida statutory requirements to facilitate employee growth (i.e., the performance improvement plan, notification of deficiencies, conference for the record).</p> <p>OL Standard 4.3: Given an individual professional development plan, determine compliance with Florida Statutes governing the School Community Professional Development Act (i.e., requirement to establish and maintain an Individual Professional Development Plan for each teacher).</p>	<p>Standard 4b: Evaluates, monitors, and provides timely feedback to faculty on the effectiveness of instruction</p> <p>Standard 4d: Identifies faculty instructional proficiency needs, including standards-based content, research-based pedagogy, data analysis for instructional planning and improvement, and the use of instructional technology</p> <p>Standard 6a: Gives priority attention to decisions that impact the quality of student learning and teacher proficiency</p> <p>Standard 7d: Promotes teacher-leadership functions focused on instructional proficiency and student learning;</p> <p>Standard 8c: Manages schedules, delegates, and allocates resources to promote collegial efforts in school improvement and faculty development</p> <p>Standard 9b: Recognizes individuals for effective performance</p>	<p>Standard 3: An education leader promotes the success of every student by ensuring management of the organization, operation, and resources for a safe, efficient, and effective learning environment</p> <p>Standard 4: An education leader promotes the success of every student by collaborating with faculty and community members, responding to diverse community interests and needs, and mobilizing community resources.</p> <p>Standard 5: An education leader promotes the success of every student by acting with integrity, fairness, and in an ethical manner</p>	<p>Standard 3.1: Candidates understand and can monitor and evaluate school management and operational systems</p> <p>Standard 3.2: Candidates understand and can efficiently use human, fiscal, and technological resources to manage school operations.</p> <p>Standard 3.5: Candidates understand and can ensure teacher and organizational time focuses on supporting high-quality school instruction and student learning.</p> <p>Standard 5.2: Candidates understand and can model principles of self-awareness, reflective practice, transparency, and ethical behavior as related to their roles within the school.</p>

	<p style="text-align: center;"><u>FELE</u></p> <p>OL: Standard 5.1: Given a sample of content from an employer's personnel file, determine compliance with Florida Statutes governing personnel files</p> <p>OL Standard 5.2: Given public information requests, determine compliance with Florida Statutes governing access to personnel files and records (e.g., medical records, complaints related to investigation, payroll deduction records, Social Security numbers)</p> <p>OL Standard 6.1: Given a recommendation to terminate an employee's contract, identify the school site administrator's responsibilities regarding termination as required in Florida Statutes (e.g., union contract, professional service contract, annual contract, continuing contract).</p> <p>OL Standard 6.2: Given case studies with accompanying documentation, identify and apply the Standard of Just Cause for any adverse employment decision as required by Florida Statutes (e.g., dismissal, suspension, demotion, reinstatement).</p> <p>OL Standard 9.1: Given a scenario, identify standards and procedures applicable to State certification, selection, evaluation, discipline, and reappointment of school district employees.</p>			
--	---	--	--	--

4. Students will practice and develop effective supervisory skills by use of video and onsite visits. N/A
5. Students will utilize their understanding of supervisory theory and develop a philosophy and understanding of supervision and evaluation, and the appropriateness of each. N/A
6. Students will develop a compilation of common ineffective teaching practices and provide strategies to correct such including research support. Same as 3
7. Students will analyze performance data and develop an instructional improvement plan.

FEAPS	FELE	FPLS	ISLLC	ELCC (NCATE)
<p>1e: Uses a variety of data, independently, and in collaboration with colleagues, to evaluate learning outcomes, adjust planning and continuously improve the effectiveness of the lessons;</p> <p>4a: Analyzes and applies data from multiple assessments and measure to diagnose students' learning needs, informs instruction based on those needs, and drives the learning process;</p> <p>4b: Designs and aligns formative and summative assessments that match learning objectives and lead to mastery</p> <p>4c: Uses a variety of assessment tools to monitor student progress, achievement and learning gains</p>	<p>IL Standard 1.2: Given a set of school data, identify appropriate objectives and strategies for developing, implementing, assessing, and revising a school improvement plan</p> <p>IL Standard 1.3: Given a school data set, determine an appropriate instructional improvement strategy.</p> <p>IL Standard 1.5: Given grade-level data on reading, identify strategies to align curriculum, instruction, and assessment.</p> <p>IL Standard 2.1: Given school-based student assessment data on reading performance, identify research-based reading instruction to improve student achievement</p> <p>IL Standard 2.2: Given school-based student assessment data on reading performance, identify instructional strategies to facilitate students' phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary, and reading comprehension throughout the content areas.</p> <p>IL Standard 2.3: Given a scenario, which may include data, identify programs or initiatives that are research based to integrate reading, writing, and mathematics across all subject areas to increase student achievement.</p>	<p>Standard 1b: Student learning results are evidenced by the student performance and growth on statewide assessments; district-determined assessments that are implemented by the district under Section 1008.22, F.S.; international assessments; and other indicators of student success adopted by the district and state</p> <p>Standard 2b: Engages faculty and staff in efforts to close learning performance gaps among student subgroups within the school.</p> <p>Standard 3b: Engages in data analysis for instructional planning and improvement</p> <p>Standard 3c: Communicates the relationships among academic standards, effective instruction, and student performance</p>	<p>Standard 1: An education leader promotes the success of every student by facilitating the development, articulation, implementation, and stewardship of a vision of learning that is shared and supported by all stakeholders</p> <p>Standard 4: An education leader promotes the success of every student by collaborating with faculty and community members, responding to diverse community interests and needs, and mobilizing community resources</p>	<p>Standard 2.2: Candidates understand and can create and evaluate a comprehensive, rigorous, and coherent curricular and instructional school program.</p>

8. Students will engage in reflective practices for improving supervisor effectiveness, instruction, and organizational performance.

APPENDIX H
MASTER OF EDUCATION IN EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP EXIT SURVEY

UCF Master's in Educational Leadership Exit Survey

Directions: Using the following scale, please rate by circling the number of your level of agreement with each of the statements regarding the Educational Leadership Master's program at the University of Central Florida.

1=Strongly Disagree; 2=Disagree; 3=Agree; 4=Strongly Agree; 5=Not Applicable

1. Course content was drawn from current best practices in the field.

1 2 3 4 5

2. Course content was drawn from research and literature.

1 2 3 4 5

3. I received frequent feedback from my instructors on my progress in class.

1 2 3 4 5

4. Faculty advisors were available to offer advice outside of class time.

1 2 3 4 5

5. Educational Leadership faculty set high expectations for student performance.

1 2 3 4 5

6. The information provided to me by my advisor was accurate and helpful.

1 2 3 4 5

7. Courses in Educational Leadership were academically challenging.

1 2 3 4 5

8. Faculty advisors kept regular office hours.

1 2 3 4 5

9. The number of students in the classes I took was appropriate for graduate level courses.

1 2 3 4 5

10. Student discussion and interactions were encouraged by instructors during class.

1 2 3 4 5

11. The administrative internship was a valuable learning experience.

1 2 3 4 5

12. Instructors expected students to be prepared for class presentations and discussions.

1 2 3 4 5

13. The intellectual climate in the department was stimulating.

1 2 3 4 5

14. The Educational Leadership department was supportive.

1 2 3 4 5

15. The Educational Leadership department adequately prepared students for comprehensive exams.

1 2 3 4 5

16. The Educational Leadership department adequately prepared students for the Florida Educational Leadership Examination.

1 2 3 4 5

17. My academic program prepared me for my professional career goals.

1 2 3 4 5

18. Courses in my major were offered frequently enough for timely completion of the program.

1 2 3 4 5

19. Textbooks required for the courses were used on a regular basis.

1 2 3 4 5

20. Student interactions and discussions added to the quality of the courses.

1 2 3 4 5

21. Online electronic databases were useful in completing the program requirements.

1 2 3 4 5

APPENDIX I
INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD APPROVAL



University of Central Florida Institutional Review Board
Office of Research & Commercialization
12201 Research Parkway, Suite 501
Orlando, Florida 32826-3246
Telephone: 407-823-2901, 407-882-2012 or 407-882-2276
www.research.ucf.edu/compliance/irb.html

From : **UCF Institutional Review Board #1
FWA00000351, IRB00001138**
To : **Vickie M. Santostefano**
Date : **March 01, 2013**

Dear Researcher:

On 3/1/2013 the IRB determined that the following proposed activity is not human research as defined by DHHS regulations at 45 CFR 46 or FDA regulations at 21 CFR 50/56:

Type of Review:	Not Human Research Determination
Project Title:	A STUDY OF THE MASTER OF EDUCATION IN EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP PROGRAM AT THE UNIVERSITY OF CENTRAL FLORIDA:STANDARDS ALIGNMENT AND STUDENT PERCEPTIONS
Investigator:	Vickie M. Santostefano
IRB ID:	SBE-13-09196
Funding Agency:	
Grant Title:	
Research ID:	N/A

University of Central Florida IRB review and approval is not required. This determination applies only to the activities described in the IRB submission and does not apply should any changes be made. If changes are to be made and there are questions about whether these activities are research involving human subjects, please contact the IRB office to discuss the proposed changes.

On behalf of Sophia Dziegielewski, Ph.D., L.C.S.W., UCF IRB Chair, this letter is signed by:

Signature applied by Joanne Muratori on 03/01/2013 10:01:48 AM EST

IRB Coordinator

LIST OF REFERENCES

- Achilles, C. M. (1994). Searching for the golden fleece: The epic struggle continues. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 30(6), 6-26.
- Adkins, E. (2009). *The effectiveness of principal preparation program type for administrative work*. (Doctoral dissertation, Marshal University Graduate College), Available from Eric.
- Alabama State Department of Education. (2012). *Alabama state board of education administrative code chapter 290-3-2*. Retrieved from Alabama Department of Education website:
<http://www.alabamaadministrativecode.state.al.us/docs/ed/290-3-2.pdf>
- Alford, B., Ballenger, J., McCune, D., & McCune, S. (2009). Obtaining validation from graduates on a restructured principal preparation program. *Journal of School Leadership*, 19, 533+. Retrieved from
<http://go.galegroup.com.ezproxy.lib.ucf.edu/ps/i.do?id=GALE%7CA229721156&v=2.1&u=orla57816&it=r&p=AONE&sw=w>
- American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education [AACTE]. (2001, March). *PK-12 educational leadership and administration* (white paper). Washington, DC.
- Anderson, L. R. (1964). *Some effects of leadership training of intercultural discussion groups*. Retrieved from
<http://ezproxy.lib.ucf.edu/login?URL=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=eric&AN=ED017873&site=ehost-live>
- Anderson, L. W., & Van, D. L. A. (1963). *Secondary school administration*. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin
- Barbour, C. B. (2005). Pupil personnel management: A problem-solving model for special education's "storms". *School Administrator*, 62(2), 54. Retrieved from
<http://ezproxy.lib.ucf.edu/login?URL=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=eric&AN=EJ710544&site=ehost-live>;
<http://www.aasa.org/SchoolAdministratorArticle.aspx?id=8800>
- Baugh, D. F. (2003). The school-based administrative internship: Requirements and student expectations. *Connections: Journal of Principal Preparation and Development*, 4, 7-12. Retrieved from
<http://ezproxy.lib.ucf.edu/login?URL=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=eric&AN=EJ676122&site=ehost-live>

- Beck, L. G., & Murphy, J. (1992). Searching for a robust understanding of the principalship. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 28(3), 387-96.
- Boodhoo, R., & Purmessur, R. (2009). Justifications for qualitative research in organizations: A step forward. *The Journal for Online Education*, 1-7. Retrieved from <http://www.nyu.edu/classes/keefer/waoe/deeprosh2>
- Bottoms, G., & O'Neill, K. (2001). *Preparing a new breed of school principals: It's time for action*. Atlanta, GA: Southern Regional Education Board. Retrieved from http://illinoischoolleader.org/research_compendium/documents/SREB_internship.pdf
- Bradley, A. (1995). NCATE accreditation of ed. schools advocated. *Education Week*, 14(20), 6. Retrieved from <http://ezproxy.lib.ucf.edu/login?URL=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=tfh&AN=9502243028&site=ehost-live>
- Bridges, E. M., & Hallinger, P. I. (1995). *Implementing problem based learning in leadership development*. Eugene, OR: ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management.
- Brown, W. J. (1921, July). *Report of the commission on the reorganization of secondary education*. Paper presented at 59th annual meeting of National Education Association, Des Moines, IA.
- Browne-Ferrigno, T. (2011). Mandated university-district partnerships for principal preparation: Professors' perspectives on required program redesign. *Journal of School Leadership*, 21(5), 735-756.
- Byrne, D., Hines, S., & McCleary, L. (1978). *The senior high school principalship*. (Vol. 1). Reston, VA: National Association of Secondary School Principals.
- Cafferty, S. (2010). *An historical analysis of the Chicago public schools policy on the requirements for the selection of principals, 1983-2008*. ProQuest LLC. ProQuest LLC, (ProQuest LLC. 789 East Eisenhower Parkway, P.O. Box 1346, Ann Arbor, MI 48106. Tel: 800-521-0600; Web site: <http://www.proquest.com/en-US/products/dissertations/individuals.shtml>) Retrieved from http://ezproxy.lib.ucf.edu/login?URL=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=eric&AN=ED524862&site=ehost-live;http://gateway.proquest.com/openurl?url_ver=Z39.88-2004&rft_val_fmt=info:ofi/fmt:kev:mtx:dissertation&res_dat=xri:pqdiss&rft_dat=xri:pqdiss:3434901

- Capasso, R. L., & Daresh, J. C. (2001). *The school administrator internship handbook: Leading, mentoring and participating in the internship program*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press
- Christie, K., Thompson, B., & Whiteley, G. (2009). *Strong leaders, strong policies*. Denver CO: Education Commission of the States.
- Cibulka, J. G. (2009). The redesign of accreditation to inform the simultaneous transformation of educator preparation and P-12 schools. *Quality Teaching*, 18(2), National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education. Retrieved from <http://ezproxy.lib.ucf.edu/login?URL=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=eric&AN=ED507916&site=ehost-live>
- Codding, J. B., & Tucker, M. S. (Eds.) (2002). *The principal challenge : Leading and managing schools in an era of accountability* (1st ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Copland, M. A. (2000, April). *Developing the problem-framing of prospective principals*. Paper presented at Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA. doi: ED442192
- Creighton, T. B., & Jones, G.D. (2001). Selection or Self-Selection? How Rigorous Are Our Selection Criteria for Education Administration Preparation Programs?.
- Darling-Hammond, L., LaPointe, M., Meyerson, D., Orr, M. T., & Cohen, C. (2007). *Preparing leaders for a changing world: Lessons from exemplary leadership development programs*. Palo Alto, CA: Stanford Educational Leadership Institute.
- Darling-Hammond, L., Meyerson, D., LaPointe, M., & Orr, M. T. (2010). *Preparing principals for a changing world*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Davis, J., & Jazzar, M. (2005). The seven habits of effective principal preparation programs. *Principal*, 84(5), 18-21. doi: 507798648
- Davis, S., Darling-Hammond, L., LaPointe, M., & Meyerson, D. (2005). *Review of research. School leadership study. Developing successful principals*. Palo Alto: Stanford Educational Leadership Institute.
- Donmoyer, R., Imber, M., & Scheurich, J. J. 1. (1995). *The knowledge base in educational administration : Multiple perspectives*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Doolittle, G., & Browne, E. G. (2011). Who moved my curriculum? Leadership preparation programs and the core technology of schools. *Journal of School*

- Leadership*, 21(2), 293-318. Retrieved from
<http://ezproxy.lib.ucf.edu/login?URL=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=eric&AN=EJ923554&site=ehost-live>;
<http://www.rowmaneducation.com/Journals/JSL/Index.shtml>
- Edmonson, S. (2002). *Effective internships for effective new administrators*. Retrieved from
<http://ezproxy.lib.ucf.edu/login?URL=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=eric&AN=ED470757&site=ehost-live>
- Education Commission of the States. (2012). *A brief history of the Education Commission of the States*. Retrieved from
<http://www.ecs.org/html/aboutECS/ECSHistory.htm>
- Education School Project (2005). *Educating school leaders. Executive summary*. Washington, DC: Author.
- Educational Leadership. University of Central Florida, College of Education. (2012). *A guide to the administrative internship in educational leadership*. Retrieved from
http://education.ucf.edu/edleadership/docs/internship_guide_FEAP.pdf
- Elmore, R. F. (1999-2000). Building a new structure for school leadership. *American Educator*, Winter, 1-9.
- English, F. W. (2011). *The SAGE handbook of educational leadership : Advances in theory, research, and practice* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Farmer, F. (1948). The public high-school principalship. *NASSP Bulletin*, 32(154), 82-91. doi: 10.1177/019263654803215416
- Florida Department of Education. (2005a). *Florida educational leadership examination (FELE)*. Retrieved from website: <http://www.fldoe.org/asp/fele/>
- Florida Department of Education, (2005b). *Florida principal leadership standards*. Retrieved from <https://www.floridaschoolleaders.org/fpls.aspx>
- Florida Department of Education. (2009). *FTCE/FELE program report*. Retrieved from Tallahassee website: <http://www.fldoe.org/asp/pdf/09perfbook.pdf>
- Florida Department of Education. (2010). *Florida educator accomplished practices*. Retrieved from <http://www.fldoe.org/profdev/FEAPs/>
- Florida Department of Education. (2012). *History of Florida's principal leadership standards*. Retrieved from <http://www.fldoe.org/profdev/fplsrevisions.asp>

- Florida State Board of Education Rules. (2005). Chapter B6-5
- Fry, B., Bottoms, G., & O'Neill, K. (2005). *The principal internship: How can we get it right?*. Retrieved from http://publications.sreb.org/2005/05V02_Principal_Internship.pdf
- Glass, T. E. (2004). *The history of educational administration viewed through its textbooks*. Lanham, MD: Scarecrow Education.
- Grissom, J. A., & Loeb, S. (2009). *Triangulating principal effectiveness: How perspectives of parents, teachers, and assistant principals identify the central importance of managerial skills. Working paper 35*. National Center for Analysis of Longitudinal Data in Education Research. Retrieved from <http://ezproxy.lib.ucf.edu/login?URL=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=eric&AN=ED509691&site=ehost-live>
- Grogan, M., & Robertson, S. (2002). Developing a new generation of educational leaders by capitalizing on partnerships. *International Journal of Educational Management, 16*(7), 314-318
- Gross, N., & Herriott, R. (1965). *Staff leadership in public schools*. New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons.
- Hale, E. L., & Moorman, H. N., (2003). *Preparing school principals: A national perspective on policy and program innovations*. Southern Illinois University, Edwardsville: Institute for Educational Leadership. Retrieved from <http://ezproxy.lib.ucf.edu/login?URL=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=eric&AN=ED504276&site=ehost-live>
- Hallinger, P. (1999). *Charter schools: Problem-based learning project. Instructor edition*. ERIC Clearinghouse. Retrieved from http://www.eric.ed.gov/ERICWebPortal/search/detailmini.jsp?_nfpb=true&_ERICExtSearch_SearchValue_0=ED434419&ERICExtSearch_SearchType_0=no&accno=ED434419
- Hallinger, P. (2003). *Reshaping the landscape of school leadership development : A global perspective*. Lisse, NL: Swets & Zeitlinger.
- Hallinger, P. I., Leithwood, K. A., & Murphy, J. L. (1993). *Cognitive perspectives on educational leadership*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Hallinger, P., & Murphy, J. (1986). *Instructional leadership in effective schools*. (). Retrieved from

<http://ezproxy.lib.ucf.edu/login?URL=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=eric&AN=ED309535&site=ehost-live>

- Hallinger, P., & Murphy, J. (1986). *Instructional leadership in effective schools*. (). Retrieved from <http://ezproxy.lib.ucf.edu/login?URL=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=eric&AN=ED309535&site=ehost-live>
- Hallinger, P. & Murphy, J. (1987). *Approaches to administrative training in education*. Albany: SUNY Press.
- Hallinger, P., & Murphy, J. (1991). Developing leaders for tomorrow's schools. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 72(7), 514-20. Retrieved from <http://ezproxy.lib.ucf.edu/login?URL=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=eric&AN=EJ422811&site=ehost-live>
- Herrington, C. D., & Wills, B. K. (2005). Decertifying the principalship: The politics of administrator preparation in Florida. *Educational Policy*, 19(1), 181-200. Retrieved from <http://ezproxy.lib.ucf.edu/login?URL=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=eric&AN=EJ690112&site=ehost-live>; <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0895904804271715>
- Hill, M. S., & Lynch, D. W. (1994). Future principals: Selecting educators for leadership. *NASSP Bulletin*, 78(565), 81-84. Retrieved from <http://ezproxy.lib.ucf.edu/login?URL=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=eric&AN=EJ492860&site=ehost-live>
- Humphrey, T. (2003). *A profile of the graduates of the educational leadership doctoral program at the University of Central Florida*. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Central Florida).
- Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium. (2008). *ISLLC administrator standards*. Retrieved from <http://dpi.wi.gov/tepedl/standards.html>
- Jackson, B. L., & Kelley, C. (2002). Exceptional and innovative programs in educational leadership. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 38(2), 192-212.
- Jacobson, P. B., Logsdon, J. D., & Wiegman, R. R. *The principalship: New perspectives (3rd. ed.)*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Judd, H. (1913). *Introduction to the scientific study of education*. Boston, MA: Ginn. Retrieved from <http://hdl.handle.net/2027/uc2.ark:/13960/t6154hp7j>

- Juusela, D. L. (2004). *An analysis of the aspiring principal preparation programs provided by Florida school districts [electronic resource]*. Orlando, FL: University of Central Florida. Retrieved from <http://purl.fcla.edu/fcla/etd/CFE0000178>
- Knapp, M. S., Copland, M. A., & Talbert, J. E. (2003). *Leading for learning: Reflective tools for school and district leaders*. Research Report, Center for the Study of Teaching and Policy. Retrieved from <http://ezproxy.lib.ucf.edu/login?URL=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=eric&AN=ED482827&site=ehost-live>
- Knezevich, S. J. (1962). *Administration of public education*. New York: Harper.
- Lashway, L. (2003). *Transforming principal preparation*. Retrieved from website: <file:///D:/digests/digest165.html>
- Leithwood, K., & Seashore-Louis, K. (2011). *Linking leadership to student learning* Jossey-Bass. Retrieved from <http://ezproxy.lib.ucf.edu/login?URL=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=eric&AN=ED527262&site=ehost-live;http://www.josseybass.com/WileyCDA/WileyTitle/productCd-0470623314.html>
- Leithwood, K., Seashore-Louis, K., Anderson, S., & Wahlstrom, K. (2004, September). *How leadership influences student learning*. Retrieved from <http://www.wallacefoundation.org/knowledge>
- Leu, D. J., & Rudman, H. C. (1963). *Preparation programs for school administrators*. Paper prepared for UCEA Career Development Seminar, East Lansing, MI.
- Levine, A. (2005). *Educating school leaders*. Washington, DC: Education Schools Project. Retrieved from http://www.edschools.org/pdf/Embargoed_Report_050315.pdf
- Levine, D. U., & Lezotte, L. W. (1990). *Unusually Effective Schools: A Review and Analysis of Research and Practice*. Madison, WI: The National Center for Effective Schools Research and Development.
- Lipham, J. M. (1981). *Effective principal, effective school*. Reston, Va: National Association of Secondary School Principals.
- Louisiana Board of Elementary and Secondary Education Teacher Certification. Standards and Administrative Regulation, Education Leader Certificate Level III, 28-9-903, 2005.

- Lumsden, L. (1993). *The new face of principal preparation* Research Roundup. Retrieved from <http://ezproxy.lib.ucf.edu/login?URL=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=eric&AN=ED352730&site=ehost-live>
- Lund, J. (2006). Creating rubrics for NCATE reports. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation & Dance (JOPERD)*, 77(3), 13-17,. Retrieved from <http://ezproxy.lib.ucf.edu/login?URL=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=eric&AN=EJ741678&site=ehost-live>; http://www.aahperd.org/aahperd/template.cfm?template=johperd_past_mar_2006.html
- Malone, B., & Caddell, T. (2000). A crisis in leadership: Where are tomorrow's principals? *Clearing House*, 73(3), 162-164
- Marshak, J. J. (2003, November). *What interns in school administration said they learned from their internship: Program implications*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Mid-South Educational Research Association, Biloxi, MS.
- McCarthy, M. M. (1999). How are school leaders prepared? Trends and future directions. *Educational Horizons*, 77(2), 74-81.
- McClure, W. (1921). The functions of the elementary school principal. *The Elementary School Journal*, 21(7), 500-514.
- Melmer, R., Burmaster, E., James, T., & Wilhoit, G. The Wallace foundation, (2008). *ISSLC educational and policy standards 2008*. Retrieved from http://www.ccsso.org/Documents/2008/Educational_Leadership_Policy_Standards_2008.pdf
- Milstein, M. M. (1992). *The Danforth program for the preparation of school principals (DPPSP) six years later: What we have learned*. Retrieved from <http://ezproxy.lib.ucf.edu/login?URL=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=eric&AN=ED355659&site=ehost-live>
- Milstein, M. M. (1993). *Changing the way we prepare educational leaders : The Danforth experience*. Newbury Park, CA: Corwin Press.
- Murphy, J. (1992). *The landscape of leadership preparation: Reframing the education of school administrators*. Newbury Park, CA: Corwin Press.
- Murphy, J. (1998). Preparation for the school principalship: the United States' story. *School Leadership and Management*, 18(3), 359-372.

- Murphy, J. (2001). The Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium standards for school leaders. *The AASA Professor* , 2-7.
- Murphy, J. (2003). *Reculturing educational leadership: The ISLLC standards ten years out*. Fairfax, VA: National Policy Board for Educational Administration. Retrieved from http://www.npbea.org/Resources/ILLC_10_years_9-03.pdf
- Murphy, J. (2005). Unpacking the Foundations of ISLLC Standards and Addressing Concerns in the Academic Community. *Educational Administration Quarterly* , 41(1), 154-191.
- Murphy, J. (2006). *Preparing school leaders: Defining a research and action agenda*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Murphy, J., Moorman, H. N., & McCarthy, M. (2008). A framework for rebuilding initial certification and preparation programs in educational leadership: Lessons from whole-state reform. *Teachers College Record*, 110(10), 2172-2203.
- Murphy, J., & Vriesenga, M. (2004). *Research on preparation programs in educational administration: An analysis* (monograph). Columbia, MO: University of Missouri-Columbia, University Council for Educational Administration.
- National Commission on Excellence in Education. (1983). *A nation at risk: The imperative for educational reform*. Washington, DC: Author.
- National Commission on Excellence in Educational Administration. (1988). *Leaders for America's schools*. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan.
- National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education. *NCATE: Making a difference*. Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved from <http://ezproxy.lib.ucf.edu/login?URL=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=eric&AN=ED495469&site=ehost-live>
- National Policy Board for Educational Administration, (2001). *Standards for advanced programs in educational leadership*. Retrieved from <http://www.ncate.org/LinkClick.aspx?fileticket=jz0BsFs7A80=&tabid=676>
- National Policy Board for Educational Administration. (2011, November). *Educational Leadership Program standards: 2011 ELCC building level* . Retrieved from <http://www.ncate.org/LinkClick.aspx?fileticket=zRZI73R0nOQ=&tabid=676>
- Nicolaidis, N., & Gaynor, A. (1989). *The knowledge base informing the teaching of administrative and organizational theory in UCEA universities: Empirical and interpretive perspectives. Improving the preparation of school administrators*.

- Notes on reform no. 5*. Retrieved from <http://ezproxy.lib.ucf.edu/login?URL=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=eric&AN=ED314829&site=ehost-live>
- Nolte, M. C. (1966). *An introduction to school administration; selected readings*. New York: Macmillan.
- Normore, A. H., & Normore, A. H. (2010). *Global perspectives on educational leadership reform : The development and preparation of leaders of learning and learners of leadership* (1st. ed.). Bingley, UK: Emerald.
- Office of Program Policy Analysis and Government Accountability. (2000). *Oppaga program review: Management training act should be revised (report no. 99-26)*. Retrieved from website: <http://www.oppaga.state.fl.us/Reports/pdf/9926rpt.pdf>
- Olson, L. (2007). Getting serious about preparation. *Education Week*, 27(3), S3-S5,. Retrieved from <http://ezproxy.lib.ucf.edu/login?URL=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=eric&AN=EJ776299&site=ehost-live>; <http://www.edweek.org/ew/toc/2007/09/12/index.html>
- Orr, M. T. (2006). Mapping innovation in leadership preparation in our nation's schools of education. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 87(7), 492-499. doi: 504150975
- Orr, M. T., & Barber, M. E. (2006). Collaborative leadership preparation: A comparative study of partnership and conventional programs and practices. *Journal Of School Leadership*, 16(6), 709-739
- Orr, M. T. (2009). Program evaluation in leadership preparation and related fields. In
- Orr, M. T. (2012). *Review of "gateways to the principalship"*. Boulder, CO: National Education Policy Center. Retrieved from <http://ezproxy.lib.ucf.edu/login?URL=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=eric&AN=ED528638&site=ehost-live>
- Orr, M. T., & Orphanos, S. (2011). How graduate-level preparation influences the effectiveness of school leaders: A comparison of the outcomes of exemplary and conventional leadership preparation programs for principals. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 47(1), 18-70. Retrieved from <http://ezproxy.lib.ucf.edu/login?URL=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=eric&AN=EJ911182&site=ehost-live>; <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0011000010378610>

- Painter, S. R. (2003). Rethinking higher admissions standards for principal preparation programs. *Planning and Changing*, 34(3/4), 197-208. Retrieved from <http://go.galegroup.com.ezproxy.lib.ucf.edu/ps/i.do?id=GALE%7CA195759734&v=2.1&u=orla57816&it=r&p=AONE&sw=w>
- Payne, W. (1875). *Chapters on school supervision*. Cincinnati, OH: Wilson, Hinkle.
- Pellicer, L. O., & Others. (1981). *The evolution and training of school principals*. Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina.
- Peterson, K., & Finn, C. (1985). Literature, history, philosophy stimulate principals, improve schools. *NASSP Bulletin* 69(485), 67-72. doi:10.1177/019263658506948513.
- Pierce, P. R., 1890-. (1935). *The origin and development of the public school principalship [electronic resource]*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press. Retrieved from <http://ufdc.ufl.edu/UF00098586>
- Portin, B. S., & Shen, J. (1998). The changing principalship: Its current status, variability, and impact. *Journal of Leadership Studies*, 5, 93. Retrieved from <http://go.galegroup.com.ezproxy.lib.ucf.edu/ps/i.do?id=GALE%7CA65357200&v=2.1&u=orla57816&it=r&p=AONE&sw=w>
- Quenneville, J. M. (2007). *Preparing school leaders: School administrators' perceptions of traditional and district level training programs*. (Doctoral Dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database: <http://ezproxy.lib.ucf.edu/login?url=http://search.proquest.com/docview/304806841?accountid=10003>
- Roach, V., Smith, W., & Boutin, J. (2011). School leadership policy trends and developments: Policy expediency or policy excellence. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 47(1), 71-113. doi: 10.1177/0011000010378611
- Sanders, N. M. & Kearney, K. M. (Eds.) (2008) *Performance expectations and indicators for education leaders. An ISLLC-based guide to implementing leader standards and a companion guide to the educational leadership policy standards: ISLLC 2008*. Washington D.C.: Council of Chief State School Officers. Retrieved from http://www.ccsso.org/Documents/2008/Performance_Indicators_2008.pdf
- Seyfarth, J. T. (1999). *The principal : New leadership for new challenges*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill.
- Sheinkopf, K. (1976). *Accent on the individual the first twelve years of Florida Technological University*. Orlando, FL: Florida Technological University

- Foundation. Retrieved from
http://digitool.fcla.edu/R/KQVCGPVA9G38NYUQCAN47IT512MH49QRRVB8VCBU3B4V3H5G1V-00002?func=search&pds_handle=GUEST
- Smith, E. J. (2008). *Competencies and skills required for certification in educational leadership in Florida*. Tallahassee, FL: Florida Department of Education. Retrieved from <http://www.fldoe.org/asp/fele/pdf/3rd-Ed-FELE-C&S.pdf>
- Snyder, K. J. (1994). The quality revolution in schools: A Florida partnership venture. *International Journal of Educational Reform*, 3(3), 279-89. Retrieved from <http://ezproxy.lib.ucf.edu/login?URL=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=eric&AN=EJ527536&site=ehost-live>
- SREB report on principal internships. (2005). *Techniques*, 80, 10. Retrieved from <http://go.galegroup.com.ezproxy.lib.ucf.edu/ps/i.do?id=GALE%7CA139206491&v=2.1&u=orla57816&it=r&p=AONE&sw=w>
- Stewart, J. (2006). Transformational leadership: An evolving concept examined through the works of Burns, Bass, Avolio, and Leithwood. *Canadian Journal of Educational Administration and Policy*, 54, 1-29. Retrieved from <http://ezproxy.lib.ucf.edu/login?URL=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=eric&AN=EJ843441&site=ehost-live>
- Szal, D., & Williams, H. S. (2011). Candidates' assessment of a principal preparation program. *Education*, 131, 481+. Retrieved from <http://go.galegroup.com.ezproxy.lib.ucf.edu/ps/i.do?id=GALE%7CA253740206&v=2.1&u=orla57816&it=r&p=AONE&sw=w>
- Tanner, C. K., Keedy, J. L., & Galis, S. A. (1995). Problem-based learning: Relating the “real world” to principalship preparation. *The Clearing House*, 68(3), 154-157 Retrieved from <http://go.galegroup.com.ezproxy.lib.ucf.edu/ps/i.do?id=GALE%7CA16998872&v=2.1&u=orla57816&it=r&p=AONE&sw=w>
- United States Department of Education. (2005). *Innovative pathways to school leadership*. Washington, DC: Office of Innovation and Improvement. Retrieved from <http://www.ed.gov/admins/recruit/prepare/alternative/index.html>
- University of Central Florida. (2012a). *Academics*. Retrieved from <http://www.ucf.edu/academics/>
- University of Central Florida, C. O. E. (2012b). *Mission and vision*. Retrieved from http://education.ucf.edu/about_mission.cfm

- University of Central Florida. (2012c). *Facts about UCF*. Retrieved from <http://www.iroffice.ucf.edu/character/current.html>
- University of Central Florida. (2012d). *University of Central Florida graduate catalog*. Orlando, FL. Retrieved from <http://www.graduatecatalog.ucf.edu/programs/program.aspx?id=1186&program=Educational Leadership MEd>
- Varrati, A. M., Tooms, A. K., & Thomas, S. B. (2006). Is NCATE the answer to current criticism of educational leadership preparation programs? *AASA Journal of Scholarship & Practice*, 3(1), 37-43. Retrieved from <http://ezproxy.lib.ucf.edu/login?URL=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=eric&AN=EJ843072&site=ehost-live>
http://www.aasa.org/uploadedFiles/Publications/Journals/AASA_Journal_of_Scholarship_and_Practice/Spring2006_FINAL.pdf
- Walker Hopp, C. (2002, February). *Developing the capacity for interactive professionalism through mentoring and principle-centered action*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, New York, NY. Retrieved from <http://ezproxy.lib.ucf.edu/login?URL=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=eric&AN=ED463257&site=ehost-live>
- Welch, S. H. (2010). *Building on successes in principal preparation: A program evaluation of the University of Washington's Danforth Educational Leadership Program*. ProQuest LLC. Retrieved from: <http://www.proquest.com/en-US/products/dissertations/individuals.shtml>); <http://ezproxy.lib.ucf.edu/login?URL=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=eric&AN=ED521344&site=ehost-live>;
http://gateway.proquest.com/openurl?url_ver=Z39.88-2004&rft_val_fmt=info:ofi/fmt:kev:mtx:dissertation&res_dat=xri:pqdiss&rft_dat=xri:pqdiss:3431663
- Wiedmer, T. (2007). Highly qualified instructional supervisors: A case for standards-driven and experiential learning. *Delta Kappa Gamma Bulletin*, 74(1), 17-2
- Wilmore, E. (2000, April). *A subgroup analysis of predictors to certification examination success in differing principal preparation programs*. Paper presented at Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association New Orleans, LA. doi: ED464154
- Winter, P. A., Rinehart, J. S., & Munoz, M. A. (2001). *Principal certified personnel: Do they want the job?* Retrieved from

<http://ezproxy.lib.ucf.edu/login?URL=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=eric&AN=ED459515&site=ehost-live>

Young, M.D., & Crow, G. (Eds.). (2012). *Handbook of research on the education of school leaders* (pp. 457-498). New York, NY: Routledge.

Young, M. D., Petersen, G. J., & Short, P. M. (2002). The complexity of substantive reform: A call for interdependence among key stakeholders. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 38(2), 137-175.